

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XL

MAY, 1925

NUMBER 5

FURTHER EVIDENCE OF REALISM IN THE FRENCH NOVEL OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.¹

In no branch of literary criticism is the exact definition of terms so essential as in the discussion of realism. Sauvageot's² description of realism is, as he himself admits, theoretical and has no complete application in French literature. He says: "Le réalisme est un système qui astreint l'art à reproduire la réalité sensible telle que l'expérience la fait connaître." Such is the theory. In point of fact we find that for example in the novel, which is the immediate subject of our remarks, realism has a much more restricted definition. The realist novelist aims at the reproduction of *unidealised* nature. In selecting his subjects he is naturally led to prefer the ugly to the beautiful so that the life which he describes is usually that of the poorer classes of society since here he is not likely to have the unity of his picture complicated by idealistic elements. It is true that even a naturalistic writer like Edmond de Goncourt discussed the possibility of what he calls *la réalité élégante* and actually produced a novel *Chérie*³ which purported to be a realistic picture of the life of a young girl "observée dans le milieu des élégances et des richesses, du pouvoir de la suprême bonne compagnie." But from the very fact that he deliberately chooses as his subject what is admittedly an exceptional and *ideal* milieu he ceases to be a realist in the restricted and com-

¹ See previous article on this subject: Green;—"Realism in the French novel in the first half of the XVIIIth century," *M. L. N.*, xxxviii, No. 6.

² David Sauvageot: *Le réalisme et le naturalisme dans la littérature et dans l'art*, Paris, 1890.

³ Paris, 1884.

monly accepted sense of the term and becomes the painter of the *moeurs* of high society.

Now all the critics, in discussing the origins of the French realist school of novelists which made its appearance about the middle of the nineteenth century, agree in the following particulars. The realist school is, they say, a reaction against the exaggerated romanticism of the school which immediately preceded it and they point to the progress made by science and positivism after 1850 as arguments in favour of the rapid development of realism in the novel. All this is irrefutable yet unsatisfactory. Realism did not, Topsy-like, "just grow" and the object of this article is to show that there was throughout the eighteenth century a steady undercurrent of realism in the French novel.

Let us first examine the attitude of the eighteenth century critics towards the realist novel of their period. Desfontaines and Voltaire are prepared to encourage a greater respect for *vraisemblance* both in the novel and in the theatre but with distinct reserves. When de la Place in his *Théâtre Anglais* defends Shakespeare's action in introducing common people into his plays he does so on the ground that they "représentent le naturel" which elicits from Desfontaines the exclamation "Mais tout ce qui est naturel, est-il beau, est-il agréable? N'est-ce pas s'avilir que de prendre plaisir à entendre parler des *fossoyeurs* et des *savetiers* . . . ?"⁴ In reply to an objection that, notwithstanding such methods Shakespeare had held the stage for one hundred and fifty years Desfontaines merely remarks that this shows that there are more *peuple* in England than in France and that the taste of this class is notoriously low.

In 1744, the Président Caulet launched an attack on novels in general, all of which he would suppress if he could.⁵ He is, however, good enough to admit that the novel of his time has increased in probability. He complains, nevertheless, that the *merveilleux dans les faits* has given way to the *merveilleux dans les caractères*. Sentiment and passion are over emphasized. The beneficent fairy of the old time novel no longer appears, it is true, but too often

⁴ *Jugements sur quelques ouvrages nouveaux*, tome IX, p. 3.

⁵ *Recueil des pièces d'éloquence et de poésie qui ont remporté les prix des Jeux Floraux en cette année 1745*. Cited in *Jugements* t. XI, p. 104.

the novel hero is extricated from one impossible situation by the simple expedient of plunging him into another and more improbable one.

Desfontaines' remarks are illuminating. He maliciously assumes that Caulet in his sweeping generalisations is condemning the novels of Marivaux, Prévost and Crébillon fils. There are, however, he suggests other novels, "surtout ceux où il ne s'agit point de galanterie et qui représentent ce qui se passe dans la vie commune." One might conclude from this that he is defending the realist novel did he not himself disillusion us. In his appreciation of that too little known classic *Les mémoires du comte de Comminge*, he says: "L'auteur, plein de respect pour son lecteur ne le conduit que dans les lieux honnêtes et jamais parmi des gens de la lie du peuple pour le régaler sottement de leur jargon et de leurs plats quolibets. Tous ses personnages sont nobles: rien de bas, rien de bourgeois dans ses peintures." This was in 1735 and it is most probable that Desfontaines was hitting at de Mouhy and Marivaux.

Some years later, on the appearance of Prévost's translation of Richardson's *Pamela* in 1742 the same critic reveals to what a degree the French literature of his time was aristocratic. He paradoxically praises Richardson for omitting "le jargon dégoûtant d'un bas domestique ou d'un homme de la lie du peuple. Si un domestique y parle, c'est simplement et raisonnablement car le bon sens est de tous les états et il plaît dans la bouche de quelque personnage que ce soit pourvu qu'il ne soit pas avili par des pensées qui sentent trop le bas peuple et qu'un honnête homme n'entend pas volontiers."⁷ In other words, he does not object to servants in novels if they speak like gentlemen, a small concession to realism at the expense of probability. However, the descriptions of Mr. B's attempts on Pamela's chastity are too realistic not to disturb Desfontaines though his objections, be it noted, are based on moral rather than on esthetic grounds. "Les attentats de Milord offrent nécessairement quelques images un peu hardies qui allarment d'abord mais qui ne laissent aucune impression dangereuse."

It is interesting from the point of view of realism to compare

⁶ *Observations sur les écrits modernes*, t. II, p. 257.

⁷ *Ibid.*, t. XXIX, p. 70 and p. 206.

Prévost's translations with the original novels of Richardson. The Frenchman's modifications and omissions are all inspired by a desire to mitigate the realism of the English models. For example, in the introduction to the translation of *Pamela*, Prévost points out that the English language is not so "châtiée" as his own. "On souffre dans celle-là des expressions qu'on ne souffrirait pas dans celle-ci." The brutality of Mr. B's speeches to Pamela is considerably toned down. In *Clarissa Harlowe* he adopts the same procedure excusing himself on the ground that "depuis vingt ans que la littérature anglaise est connue à Paris, on sait que pour s'y faire naturaliser, elle a souvent besoin de ces petites réparations."⁸ Even the immaculate *Grandisson* has to be purged of certain too realistic passages. "J'ai supprimé ou réduit aux usages communs de l'Europe ce que ceux de l'Angleterre peuvent avoir de choquant pour les autres nations. Il m'a semblé que ces restes de l'ancienne grossièreté britannique sur lesquels il n'y a que l'habitude qui puisse encore fermer les yeux aux Anglais, déshonorerait un livre où la politesse doit aller de pair avec la noblesse et la vertu."⁹

An observation regarding Fielding's *Amelia* in the *Correspondance littéraire de Raynal, Grimm, Diderot et Meister* is illuminating.¹⁰ Why are there not in French literature, asks the critic, domestic novels like those of Fielding? He concludes that this phenomenon is due not to any lack of competent novelists but rather to the want of subject matter. "Quand on a peint nos petits maîtres et nos petites maîtresses" he continues, "on a à peu près épuisé la matière et mis tout le national qu'il est possible de mettre dans un roman français. Tels sont les ouvrages de M. Crébillon fils qu'on pourrait proprement appeler les romans domestiques de la nation." In this connection he mentions *Le Voyage de Mantes* which is by the way a most realistic picture of French lower middle class life.¹¹ From his remarks on this novel he indicates quite plainly the current attitude towards works of

⁸ Introduction to his translation of *Clarissa Harlowe*, 1751.

⁹ Introduction to his translation of *Grandisson*, 1755.

¹⁰ Tome II, p. 267 (1753).

¹¹ See my *La peinture des mœurs de la bonne société dans le roman français de 1715 à 1761*, p. 148.

this kind. "Voilà donc un roman domestique que personne cependant ne saurait; c'est qu'indépendamment du défaut de talent dans l'auteur, les personnages du roman sont tous des gens qui n'ont point d'existence dans la société et dont les aventures par conséquent ne sauraient nous attacher. Le quartier de la Halle et de la place Maubert a sans doute ses moeurs, et très marquées même, mais ce ne sont pas les moeurs de la nation. Elles ne méritent donc pas d'être peintes. . ."

When Mme Puisieux's translation of *Amélia* appeared in 1763 we learn that it had no success.¹² "Personne ne l'a lu; les femmes en ont dit des horreurs." The writer praises, however, the *vraisemblance* of Fielding's characters who resemble the everyday man. Of the realism of the scene in the *mauvais lieu*, for instance, he says nothing but it is easy to see that it was precisely this sort of writing which so horrified the susceptible French ladies.

Accordingly to the Goncourts, the truly realist novel must be *documentaire* and it is well known that Flaubert's *Madame Bovary* was founded on actual fact. There are several examples of this procedure in the French novel of the eighteenth century. Thus the actress Clairon is the heroine of a novel by G. de la Bataille.¹³ De Mouhy used the adventures of Anne de Moras, comtesse de Courbon as material for one of his stories¹⁴ while Mauvillon's *Le soldat parvenu*¹⁵ was based on actual fact. Again; Fréron informs us that d'Arnaud's *Les Epoux malheureux* is another example of documentation. "C'est une histoire véritable et récente et qui vient de se passer sous nos yeux."¹⁶ It is the history of

¹² *Corr. litt.*, etc., t. 5.

¹³ *Histoire de la vie de Mlle. Cronel*, 1739; see *Peinture des moeurs*, etc., p. 135.

¹⁴ *Mémoires d'Anne de Moras*, etc.; La Haye, 1739-1740. See *Peinture des moeurs*, etc., p. 134.

¹⁵ *Le soldat parvenu ou les mémoires de M. de Verval dit Belle-Rose*, Dresde, 1735. See *Peinture des moeurs*, etc., p. 138.

¹⁶ *Lettres de Mme la comtesse de . . . sur quelques écrits modernes*, Genève, 1746. It is interesting to note as an early example of documentation in the French novel *Les Egarements des passions*, etc., Paris, 1697. Of this work Boudot says: "Ce livre contient XIX aventures dont la Xe est l'histoire de la femme d'un papetier de la rue St. Jacques nommé Depuy et mère de M. Depuy intendant au Canada" (Bib. L'Arsenal, ms. 7067).

Mme de la Bedoyère who was an actress at the Théâtre des Italiens.

We shall see, however, that despite the existence of a considerable body of opinion opposed to realism in the novel, there is a steadily growing current of realist fiction in the eighteenth century. Let us now examine, then, some examples of novels of this sort published between 1731 and 1781.

That pioneer of realism in the French novel of the nineteenth century, Champfleury, remarks: ¹⁷ "A mon sens Challes est le premier qui ait employé la réalité absolue dans le roman. Tous ses personnages sont de petits nobles ou des bourgeoises du temps. Ils parlent le langage de leur époque; ils portent des noms de la fin du XVIIe siècle. Enfin, ils donnent une peinture fidèle des mœurs d'alors." Now, an examination of Challes' *Illustres Françaises* ¹⁸ will show us that Champfleury exaggerates. It is true that Challes, like Lesage and Marivaux, ably represents the new movement which tended towards a closer observance of probability in the novel. But we must be on our guard always against the specious promises which Challes and so many of his contemporaries hold out in their prefaces. The usual practice of such novelists is to claim in their introduction that they are merely relating something which has actually occurred and which therefore must be perfectly probable. Says Challes: "J'ai affecté la simple vérité. Si j'avais voulu, j'aurais embelli le tout par des aventures de commande mais je n'ai rien voulu dire qui ne fût vrai et s'il y a quelque chose qui puisse paraître fabuleux ce sera l'action de Du Puis qui se perce le corps dans la chambre de Madame de Londé; cependant je n'ai pas dû le taire puisqu'elle est vrai." Strange to say, despite this naïve attempt at "suggestion," the reader is not always convinced of the probability of many of the incidents related in the *Illustres Françaises*. It must, however, be conceded that there are flashes of realism in these *contes*, but it is an exaggerated and brutal realism which betrays its picaresque origin. Here is a specimen of his manner. One of the characters, Des Francs, is bathing with a friend near the Pont neuf. A soldier throws down some filth which strikes Des Francs on the face. This is what ensues. "Vous en riez et qui n'en rirait? Les

¹⁷ *Le réalisme*, 1857.

¹⁸ 1713. See also his *Histoires françaises, galantes et comiques*, 1712.

regardants en rirent aussi. Je n'en ris pas moi. Je plongeai pour me nettoyer et, coupant entre les bateaux, je vins prendre terre au-dessous des degrés. Je les montai nu et à la merci des coups de fouet des charretiers qui ne me les épargnèrent point. Je passai sur le Pont Neuf et tombai côte à côte sur mon coquin de soldat qui croyait en être quitte. Je le pris par les cheveux, je lui donnai trois ou quatre coups de poing sur le nez et le jetai du haut du pont dans la rivière où je me jetai après lui. La surprise que mon action lui avait causée et une si grande chute l'avait étourdi. Ses habits l'entraînaient au fond de l'eau et si on n'avait été à son secours c'était un soldat noyé."

Mme Meheust's *Histoire d'Emilie*¹⁹ is a frank protest against the idealism of the *Clélie* type of love story. It is the account of the infatuation of a low-born girl for a man some years her senior. Emilie, though brought up on the impossibly romantic fiction of the *Hypolite* brand, scandalises her mother's friends by bursting out laughing at their naïve fondness for such literature. Saint Hilaire, with whom she falls in love, never suspecting that this child, as she seems to him, is capable of a 'grande passion,' brings her little gifts from the Foire Saint Laurent. Emilie, enraged at his obtuseness, one day throws the presents at him and blurts out: "N'auriez-vous jamais que ces badineries à me donner?" She then suggests that he should 'lend her his heart for twenty-four hours.' The result is that the mother discovers the affair and bundles off her precocious daughter to a convent. The romantic Saint Hilaire puts up at a village near by and for two days prowls round the nunnery, becoming of course, a marked man. In the words of the disgusted Emilie: "A quoi sert cette fantaisie qu'on peut nommer espagnole? A quoi sert-elle? A me faire observer davantage. Un homme fait et vêtu comme était M. de Saint Hilaire attira les regards des villageois et pour surcroît de malheur une soeur tourière, curieuse et alerte, examina soigneusement les démarches du très affligé cavalier. Cette soeur avertit la portière qui le redit à la mère des pensionnaires et celle-ci va le conter à la supérieure. Conseil extraordinairement assemblé, grande rumeur parmi les béates. Cet homme en veut à une des pensionnaires. Tout est perdu." The locksmith is called in but

¹⁹ *Histoire d'Emilie ou les amours de Mlle. . . .*, Paris, 1732.

is laughed at in the proverbial way since Emilie establishes communication with her lover through the servant of a mutual friend, one of the *pensionnaires*.

*L'histoire de Gogo*²⁰ is a realistic account of the adventures of a servant girl in the underworld of Paris. On the death of her parents the heroine, Gogo, is left to the tender mercies of an avaricious aunt who retains the girl's small fortune and hands her over to a devout old harpy with an extremely shady past. The girl is deprived of her liberty and becomes a drudge. One day, however, a neighbor, the wife of a *procureur*, hearing Gogo sing asks her mistress to allow the servant to visit her. The old harpidan consents, calculating that the *procureur* may help her with a lawsuit in which she is involved. Gogo meets the lawyer's nephew with whom she falls violently in love. "Le reste de cette soirée," she says, "je ne vis les actions des autres hors celles de mon amant qu'à travers un nuage." Her main idea is now to meet her lover clandestinely but as a result of a scene with her mistress, she is forbidden to leave the house. Whilst brooding in her attic, 'looking at the sky and the tiles,' she suddenly sees her lover, Gerville, setting a trap for sparrows on the roof. Terrified lest he should go without seeing her, she seizes a jug of water and leaning out at the window pours it into the gutter between the houses. Gerville looks up, sees her and comes over into her room. Gogo's joy is clouded by the thought that she may be released from her welcome confinement so she contrives to be caught pretending to escape and is of course again shut up in her room. Here the author interjects: "Quelques gens de mauvaise humeur diront peut-être. Il entre ici trop de réflexion; cela n'est pas vraisemblable. Quelle apparence qu'une jeune fille pense ainsi à tout? Mais je renvoie ces incrédules à celles qui, comme moi, ont aimé."

The *procureur*'s family moves taking Gerville with them. A bogus baroness comes to live in their house and on the strength of a false engagement persuades Gogo to allow herself to be seduced by an accomplice, the marquis de Blenci. Gogo writes to Gerville confessing everything and the two go off to Lyons. Gerville is however recaptured by his parents and sent to the navy.

Gogo turns adventuress and arrives in Paris. After a disrepu-

²⁰ La Haye, 1739, anonymous.

table adventure with an old financier she seduces the latter's young nephew. The police now take the affair in hand and she is forced to change her name. By the merest accident she hears at her dressmaker's that a *lettre de cachet* is out against her. It happens that the wife of the policeman who is deputed to arrest her is gossiping with the dressmaker when Gogo arrives. I quote the passage as an example of realist description and because it is an admirable picture of the *moeurs* of a class not usually described in the literature of the time outside the reports of the Hôpital prison.

"La femme de l'exempt dans cette intervalle se tenait debout et lorsque je fus assise, voyant qu'on ne lui disait pas d'en faire autant, elle y resta encore. Malgré l'attention que portait ma couturière à ce que je lui disais, elle ne put s'empêcher de lui dire: 'Hé bien, mademoiselle, vous vous en allez donc?' (façon de la congédier assez cavalière) qu'elle interpréta néanmoins comme une invitation de prendre part à la conversation et afin d'y fournir par ce qu'elle crut de plus intéressant. 'Ah! mon dieu, oui' dit-elle, en se rasseyant, 'je ne peux rester plus longtemps. Poussant, (c'était le nom de son mari) veut souper et se coucher de bonne heure pour être en état d'aller demain donner le reveil-matin à une bonne dame qui se passerait bien de la visite. . . . Ce sont de ces marquises, comtesses, baronnes, veuves d'officiers dont il y en a plus à l'Hôpital qu'il n'en reste de véritables dans tout le royaume: de ces tripots, brelans ou comme il vous plaira leur donner le nom car cela peut porter celui qu'on veut pourvu qu'il soit vilain et je ne doute point que Madame ne soit trop intéressée à voir punir ces coquines pour les plaindre. Vous voyez installer cela avec quatre tables de quadrille, une méchante tapisserie, deux sixains de cartes, un laquais, une femme de chambre à la marque pour les jours de bonne compagnie, une nièce ou voisine jolie cela vous rafle toute la jeunesse d'un quartier et le peu qui restent d'honnêtes personnes se trouvent vis à vis de rien. Ce n'est pas que je parle pour moi car nous ne sommes pas assez grosse dame' (ce qu'elle continuait d'un ton à ne pas laisser douter qu'elle n'était pas toujours si modeste), 'mais l'on entend parler ses voisines et l'on sait où elles en sont. Il ne faut qu'approcher de ces choses pour en être scandalisée. Nous en avons comme cela de

nouvellement venues dans notre maison. Cela crie vengeance. Vous ne voyez que fiacres, brouettes, porteurs, plumets, abbés, rotisseurs—c'est un vacarme perpétuel. Si on était *langues* voyez, je vous prie, à quoi des misérables comme cela seraient exposées mais ces drôlesses-là ont souvent avec elles de fâcheuses suites et l'on est encore contrainte de se taire par charité."

Gogo escapes and again meets the baroness who gives her a vivid description of her early struggles against poverty and of her life as a *cocotte*. Exploited by an unscrupulous accomplice she became his procuress and for twelve years carried on her vile trade amongst "les petites filles brodeuses, couturières, raccommodeuses de dentelles, faiseuses de pompons, de paniers et d'autres brimborions." Wealthy now and a woman of fashion she takes Gogo under her wing and launches her on a stage career.

Villaret's *La belle Allemande* (1745) is a good example of didactic realism. The heroine, speaking of the valets and artisans who figure on the copious list of her lovers, says: "Ces vils mortels, pour occuper les derniers rangs de la société n'en sont pas pour cela des objets moins dignes d'attention; d'autant plus propres à nous instruire que chez eux les vices grossiers et tout nus s'y montrent à découvert sans que les yeux puissent être fascinés par ces dehors imposteurs qui couvrent souvent le même fonds dans un monde plus poli." There is just one glimpse of idealism when the heroine, Thérèse, to her mother's disgust falls in love with a decent man who is willing to forget the past and to send her to a nunnery till their marriage. However, Villaret's sense of realism rebels at this dénouement and the lover is forced by parental pressure and by fear of losing his position to give up Thérèse who is reclaimed by her mother and settled in the harem of a rich financier.

I have previously indicated the importance of Caylus²¹ in the history of realism. A remark by Raynal²² is interesting in this connection. "Le comte de Caylus, M. de Maurepas et quelques autres ont commencé il y a quelques années à écrire du style du peuple et sur les mœurs du peuple. Ce genre est tombé depuis à M. de Vadé qui vient de s'élever à la poésie. Il a publié un

²¹ *Modern Language Notes*, xxxviii, No. 6, p. 324.

²² *Correspondance de Grimm*, etc., t. II, p. 40 (1751).

poème intitulé *La Pipe cassée*." Raynal, of course, condemns the tendency, but Caylus, whose favourite field was the Halles, became an expert in the use of the popular dialect and founded *la littérature poissarde*. His *Lettres de la Grenouillère* and his *Fêtes rou-lantes*²³ are illuminating and sympathetic etchings of the life of the Parisian plebs though marred by a too great insistence on the Rabelaisian aspect of his subject.

It is unnecessary even in a study of this sort to enter into an analysis of *Les plaisirs secrets d'Angélique*.²⁴ Let it suffice to say that we have here an example of the grossest realism which it is possible to find in a narrative occupied with the study of sex relations.

A good example of documentation in the novel is Guer's *Pinolet*²⁵ the story of the life of a blind man who was a well known Parisian character. Guer, while admitting that to be truly realistic, an author must make his characters speak their natural language, excuses himself on the grounds that he does not know patois. Since, then, he cannot be absolutely accurate, he prefers not to pretend to be so at all. His grasp of peasant psychology reminds one of de Maupassant. Pinolet says: "A la campagne surtout, on n'aime pas les personnages inutiles. Le paysan, comme les gens de coeur, fuit les objets dégoûtants. Grondé des uns, battu par les autres je me trouvais fort embarrassé de ma figure." There is a reversion to the realism of the picaresque sort in the description of Pinolet's abduction by a villainous beggar, Jean Valois, but Guer has the faculty of extracting realism from the most insignificant incidents. The blind man seldom meets with kindness. Children put soot in his bowl and filth on his bread. He excites the envy of local blind men in the villages where he stops. On the whole Guer's outlook is extremely pessimistic and his novel is really an indictment of the sordid materialism of the French peasant. In this connection let me mention in passing Des Bies' *Nine*²⁶ which though for the most part a romantic novel contains some realistic pictures of peasant life.

²³ Approximately 1747.

²⁴ Londres, 1751. Seized by police. According to d'Hémery, chief of police, it is by l'abbé de la Suze. Le marquis de Paulmy however attributes it to l'abbé Delsue. (Bib. de l'Arsenal, ms. 7067.)

²⁵ *Pinolet ou l'aveugle parvenu*, Amsterdam, 1755.

²⁶ Amsterdam, 1756.

At first sight when one considers the extraordinary popularity of the novel of sentiment in the second half of the eighteenth century, it seems futile to hope for a survival of that realism the persistence of which we have been noting. Sentiment and realism appear mutually antagonistic if not mutually exclusive. Yet the contrary, I think, is the case.

At the end of the seventeenth century realism was an adjunct to satire. It was the instrument of satire in *Le Roman bourgeois* and in the *Roman comique*. We shall see that in the second half of the eighteenth century realism becomes the instrument of sentiment. The object of writers like Rousseau was to move their readers, to harrow them by recitals of passionate and unhappy love with all its complications. Their heroes are high-souled philanthropists oozing with the milk of human kindness. Bearing this in mind, what was more natural than to depict such heroes moving in drab surroundings and succoring decayed gentlewomen reduced to the direst poverty. The description of the sordid milieu was to provide yet another means of harrowing the sentimental soul. Realism becomes then the key which unlocks the floodgates of sentiment. Such is exactly the case in *Dorval*.²⁷ The hero is a sort of Grandisson who devotes his wealth to the relief of distress. One windy night he sees a poor creature shivering near the Palais Royal. He escorts her to her home in the rue Vivienne. Now for the realism. "Une chambre ou plutôt un galetas formait tout le logement. Un châlit couvert d'une méchante paille, d'un plus mauvais matelas et d'une très maigre couverture, quelques chaises en partie brisées, une table à demi rompue formaient le triste ameublement de ce séjour de douleur. . . ." The story continues in this tone.

The greatest exponent of sentimental realism in the novel of this time is Rétif de la Bretonne. His works, particularly *Monsieur Nicholas* (1796), teem with realist pictures of almost every category of low life. Realism with him is used not only to excite compassion but also to illustrate moral and social truths. The theme of the *Paysan perversi* (1776) for example is didactic: it is a warning to peasants not to leave the innocence of the hamlet for

²⁷ By Damiens de Gomicourt, Amsterdam, 1769.

the vice of the city. The poor serving wench also comes into her own. His *Tiennette* though more realistic than Richardson's famous creation, yet has all Pamela's virtue and her annoying habit of kissing the hand that buffets her. The description of the downfall of Edmond the perverted peasant is vividly realist. The *maison publique* has no mysteries for Rétif who spares his reader nothing not even the revolting episode of the meeting between Edmond and his sister in one of these establishments. It is surely here that de Maupassant borrowed the idea for his *Le Port*.

As an indication of the growing change in the attitude of the critic towards realism let me quote the *Correspondance litteraire* for 1775 and 1785. The *Paysan perversi* "promène l'esprit sur les scènes de la vie les plus dégoûtantes et les plus viles et cependant il attache, il entraîne." Ten years later the same critic speaking of the *Paysanne perversie*, says: "Ce sont des peintures les plus vives des séductions du vice et du libertinage mis en contraste avec les mœurs les plus simples et les plus pures, et les suites les plus effrayantes d'une vie déréglée." It will be observed that though the second novel is just as realistic as the first there is no longer any talk of its being vile or disgusting. The didactic value of the novel is the chief consideration so that any means are justifiable if the end be good.

Of Gorjy nothing is known save that he was nearly guillotined for a satire against Marat. He is, however, extremely important from our point of view. A sentimentalist and a realist his most suggestive novel is *Victorine* (1789). Victorine is entrusted to the care of a drunken washerwoman by a compassionate officer who rescues her from a burning house. This washerwoman, known as Marianne, is an interesting and faithful study of a drunken hag. To excite our sympathy for Victorine Gorjy plunges us into the dregs of realism. "Le soir Marianne se mit avec plusieurs de ses commères à boire jusqu'à ne pouvoir plus se soutenir tandis que mon souper fut à l'ordinaire du pain bis et dur, des fèves cuites dans un peu de graisse et quelques gorgées d'eau qu'il fallait boire à même d'un vieux pot de terre égueulé. . . Enfin, l'ivresse et le sommeil absorbèrent toutes leurs facultés. L'une s'étendit sur sa chaise et s'endormit en répandant sur elle un verre de vin qu'elle avait voulu, mais inutilement, porter à sa bouche. L'autre,

couchée sur la table ronflait à ne pas s'entendre. Celle-ci renversée sur le planche se vautrait dans le débris du repas. Celle-là toute débraillée s'était inondée elle-même du vin qu'elle avait bu. Marianne, échevelée, le visage dégouttant de sueur poussait des éclats de rire effrayants en voyant ses compagnes dans l'état où elles étaient. Elle voulut se lever; les jambes lui manquèrent. Elle tomba sur un banc, sa tête porta et aussitôt son visage fut couvert de sang."

F. C. GREEN.

University of Manitoba.

CHAUCEER'S RENUNCIATION OF LOVE IN *TROILUS*

Perhaps no part of Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* has puzzled readers more than the renunciation of human love contained in the following familiar lines in the epilogue:

O yonge fresshe folkes, he or she,
 In which that love up groweth with your age,
 Repeyareth hoom from worldly vanitee,
 And of your herte up-casteth the visage
 To thilke god that after his image
 Yow made, and thinketh al nis but a fayre
 This world, that passeth sone as floures fayre.
 And loveth him, the which that right for love
 Upon a cros, our soules for to beye,
 First starf, and roos, and sit in hevene a-bove;
 For he nil falsen no wight, dar I seye,
 That wol his herte al hoolly on him leye.
 And sin he best to love is, and most meke,
 What nedeth feyned loves for to seke?¹

As every one knows, the suggestion for such an address to young folk came to Chaucer directly enough from the opening lines of the following parallel stanza in *Filostrato*:

O giovanetti, ne' quai coll' etate
 Surgendo vien l'amoroso disio,
 Per Dio vi prego che voi raffreniate
 I pronti passi all' appetito rio,

¹ *Troilus and Criseyde*, v, 1835-1848.

E nell' amor di Troilo vi specchiate,
 Il qual dimostra suso il verso mio,
 Perchè se ben col cuor gli leggerete,
 Non di leggieri a tutte crederete.²

That Chaucer received from Boccaccio no more than the merest suggestion, however, is obvious to one who reads the four succeeding stanzas in the Italian poem. Boccaccio is addressing young *men*, advising them to restrain their amorous desire, to remember that young women are fickle, vain, and unbalanced, to choose cautiously the "perfetta donna" who really desires love and who is circumspect and truthful, and to pray that they may escape loving and dying for evil women. From this doctrine Chaucer departs completely, and in at least two different ways. In the first place, to Boccaccio's aspersions upon young women in general³ Chaucer opposes, a few lines earlier,⁴ a passage addressed to women, in which he charges men with their full share of duplicity and infidelity. "Beth war of men!"⁵—this is Chaucer's retort to Boccaccio's disparagement of women. Chaucer's more fundamental alteration in Boccaccio's address, however, is the substitution of a moving Christian appeal to amorous young people, quoted above, for which the *Filostrato* offers not a hint.⁶

Since this appeal constitutes a virtual renunciation of the poem that precedes, no reader can escape here a feeling of bewilderment and a desire to discover some reasonable affiliation between the two. This desire Professor Tatlock has recently satisfied in very con-

² *Filostrato*, VIII, 29, 1-8.

⁴ *T. and C.*, v, 1779-1785.

³ See *id.*, VIII, 30, 1-31, 8.

⁵ *T. and C.*, v, 1785.

⁶ I assume that no one will venture to recognize such a hint in the passage (*Filostrato*, VIII, 33, 3-5),

ed orazione
 Per lui fate ad amor pietosamente,
 Ch' el posi in pace.

Miss Lisi Cipriani (*Publications of the Modern Language Association*, Vol. XXII [1907], pp. 582-583) infers that the Chaucerian stanzas show "most distinctly" the influence of the *Roman de la Rose* (ed. F. Michel, Vol. I, Paris, 1864, lines 4894-5349). But since the Christian parallels that Miss Cipriani cites specifically are confined to a passage (Michel, lines 5018-5121) which is "une grossière interpolation" (see *Le Roman de la Rose*, ed. E. Langlois, Vol. I, Paris, 1914, pp. 47-48), I assume that the alleged influence upon Chaucer may safely be disregarded.

siderable measure.⁷ He suggests that the two stanzas before us "express the natural enough revulsion of a medieval mind to the strong emotion and painful outcome of the love story"; and further, that on behalf of his English readers and of himself Chaucer felt the need of a counterpoise to the unprecedented reality of the physical passion in the poem. "High and ennobling as the poem is, in no other medieval work is physical passion depicted with such naturalness and sympathy and made so attractive With the wholly new intensity and reality of the poem, then, such an ending may well have been felt as satisfying and as more fitting than an unreligious close or a mere perfunctory muttered *Qui cum Patre*."⁸

But although this interpretation is truly illuminating and convincing, it cannot be said to include all the possibilities. One may still harbor an impression that Chaucer's renunciation bears upon the poem also in a somewhat less general way. Since the love-story seems to be written in accordance with the principles of courtly love,⁹ one may reasonably inquire, for example, whether the pious stanzas under consideration may apply in some definite fashion to this particular element in the composition as a whole.¹⁰

In the wording of the English lines, I confess, I can discern no precise reference to courtly love. One might be tempted to see in the word *feyned* ("feyned loves") a reference to the "fictitious"¹¹ aspect of the courtly system, and in "worldly vanitee,"

⁷ J. S. P. Tatlock, *The Epilog of Chaucer's Troilus*, in *Modern Philology*, Vol. XVIII (1921), pp. 635-640.

⁸ Tatlock, pp. 637, 638, 640.

⁹ A somewhat inclusive bibliography in support of this interpretation is given by the present writer in *University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature*, No. 2 (1918), pp. 367-368. See also R. K. Root, *The Poetry of Chaucer*, Revised Edition, Boston, 1922, pp. 102-112.

¹⁰ Professor Tatlock (p. 638, note 3) anticipates such a query, and conveys the general impression that courtly love contributed relatively little toward inciting Chaucer's disavowal.

¹¹ For this meaning of *feyned* see the *New English Dictionary* (feigned. 2). Concerning the fictitious aspect of courtly love see G. Zonta, in *Studi Medievali* (ed. F. Novati and R. Renier), Vol. III (1908-11), pp. 49-68; V. Crescini *Nuove Postille al Trattato Amorofo d'Andrea Capellano*, in *Atti del Reale Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti*, Vol. 69, Part II (1909-10), pp. 1-99, 473-504,—especially pp. 36-37.

a direct warning against the same code. Thus young folk would be warned away from the kind of love embodied in the story of Troilus and Criseyde and recommended to the love of Christ. The opposition would then lie between *courtly* love and *heavenly* love. But however agreeable this specific interpretation might be to logic or architectonics, it must be admitted that the plain intent of Chaucer's stanzas is something more sweeping. The poet is renouncing not a particular code of love, but all the love in "this world, that passeth sone as floures fayre." As Troilus's departed spirit had observed, we "sholden *al* our herte on hevene caste."¹² The opposition really lies, then, between *earthly* love and *heavenly* love. The love of this world is "feyned" in the sense of "false" or "unstable"; only the love of Christ is true and permanent.

Although, then, the renunciation cannot be attached to the underlying amorous doctrine with detailed precision, there remains between the two at least a certain general attachment. In turning his back upon his love-story Chaucer inevitably condemned courtly love, along with undue physical passion, and along with any other unsanctified elements in the poem; hence there is no obstacle to one's surmising that Chaucer's revulsion of feeling arose as much from the false principles of courtly love in the poem as from the intensity and reality of the physical passion. Possibly, indeed, the influence arising from courtly love was the greater. Such seems to be the view of Professor Kittredge when he writes,¹³ concerning the Chaucerian passage under consideration, "We come more and more to suspect that Troilus was right in his first opinion;¹⁴ that the principles of the code [of courtly love] are somehow unsound He [Chaucer] has no solution except to repudiate the unmoral and unsocial system which he has pretended to uphold."

Those who share in this opinion, as I do, that the poet's revulsion of feeling arose more from the unsound morals of the poem than from its intense passion, may find a certain support, perhaps, from a piece of writing which, so far as I know, has not yet been

¹² *T. and C.*, v, 1825.

¹³ G. L. Kittredge, *Chaucer and His Poetry*, Cambridge, 1915, p. 143.

¹⁴ Troilus's first opinion is seen in his scoffing at love and lovers in Book I, lines 183-205. See Kittredge, p. 142.

brought to bear upon the Chaucerian disavowal. For it appears that the English poet was not the first who, after presenting the merits and practices of courtly love, suddenly renounced what he had done. Chaucer's procedure may perhaps seem less surprising when one recalls that Andreas Capellanus, the acknowledged codifier, expositor, and apologist of the courtly system,¹⁵ uttered himself a similar renunciation. This utterance of Andreas occupies the third, and last, book of his *De Amore*, and is entitled *De reprobatione amoris*. Addressing the same Gualterius who is named in the preface to the whole work, Andreas solemnly declares that his fundamental purpose in expounding the art of love in the preceding two books has been to enable Gualterius, by avoiding love, to achieve the greater reward in heaven.¹⁶ Having received full instruction in the nature and practice of courtliness, let the pupil renounce it altogether. The specific arguments whereby Andreas would dissuade his protégé from the amorous life are prolix and repetitious; hence I present them only in brief summary.

Having ordained marriage for mankind, God forbids extramarital *amours*.¹⁷ It is irrational, therefore, to abandon one's eternal inheritance bought by Christ's blood, for a momentary pleasure of the flesh.

Quod ergo bonum ibi poterit inveniri, ubi nihil nisi contra Dei geritur voluntatem? Heu, quantus inest dolor, quantave nos cordis amaritudo detentat, quum dolentes assidue cernimus propter turpes et nefandos Veneris actus hominibus coelestia denegari! O miser et insanus ille ac plus quam bestia reputandus, qui pro momentanea carnis delectatione gaudia derelinquit aeterna et perpetuae gehennae flammis se mancipare laborat! . . . Cuiuslibet igitur hominis satis est admiranda stultitia, qui pro vilissimis Veneris amplexibus terrenis hereditatem amittit aeternam, quam ipse Rex coelestis cunctis hominibus proprio sanguine recuperavit

¹⁵ *Andreas Capellani . . . De Amore Libri Tres*, ed. E. Trojel, Copenhagen, 1892. As to Andreas's acknowledged position as an expositor of courtly love see, for example, Crescini, *op. cit.*, p. 1, 16-17; Fauriel, in *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, Vol. XXI (1847), pp. 320-326; G. Paris, in *Romania*, Vol. XII (1883), pp. 523-524; E. Langlois, *Origines et Sources du Roman de la Rose*, Paris, 1891, pp. 23-24; W. G. Dodd, *Courtly Love in Chaucer and Gower*, Boston, 1913, pp. 3-9.

¹⁶ See Andreas, pp. 313-314.

¹⁷ See Andreas, pp. 314-315, 331-332.

amissam.¹⁸ Immo ad summam scimus verecundiam pertinere viventis et Dei omnipotentis iniuriam, si carnis illecebras et corporis voluptates secutus ad Tartareos iterum laqueos elabatur, ex quibus laqueis pater ipse coelestis semel eum unigeniti filii sui sanguinis effusione salvavit.¹⁹

Amours destroy friendships (id., pp. 316 f.), lead to poverty (p. 320), crimes (pp. 324-326), and wars (pp. 330 f.), incapacitate men for affairs (pp. 327 f.), weaken men's bodies (pp. 335-337), and impair their judgments (pp. 337 f.). Since illicit love has all these faults, and many others,²⁰ let Gualterius shun love's arts and watch for the coming of the heavenly bridegroom.

Cave igitur, Gualteri, amoris exercere mandata et continua vigilatione labora, ut, quum venerit sponsus, inveniat te vigilantem, nec de corporis iuventute confisum mundana delectatio te faciat in peccati dormitione iacere ac de sponsi tarditate securum, quia, eiusdem sponsi voce testante, nescimus diem neque horam.²¹

Clearly, then, Andreas utters a sweeping renunciation of the courtly love which he had previously expounded and illustrated, and which he had commended as *omnium fons et origo bonorum*.²²

¹⁸ Concerning the syntax of this sentence the editor remarks, "Error hic aliquis latet." But the general sense is apparent.

¹⁹ Andreas, pp. 314-316. Cf. pp. 322-323.

²⁰ I am not undertaking to follow out the ramifications of Andreas's argument; and I omit his long and violent denunciation of women (pp. 338-357).

²¹ Andreas, pp. 360-361.

²² See Andreas, p. 81. The question as to whether Andreas was the more earnest in his *exposition* of courtly love (*De Amore*, Books I and II) or in his *renunciation* of it (*De Amore*, Book III) does not concern us fundamentally here. Whereas Zonta (pp. 57, 66) holds that the *renunciation* is the more sincere part, P. Rajna (*Tre Studi per la Storia del Libro di Andrea Cappellano*, in *Studj di Filologia Romanza*, Vol. v [1891], pp. 193-272,—especially p. 256) argues that the *exposition* rings truer. It has also been suggested (by Crescini, p. 36, for example, and by Rajna, p. 257) that in attaching a renunciation to his treatise Andreas was influenced by the relation of Ovid's *Remedia Amoris* to the *Ars Amatoria*. But one scarcely need remark that Ovid's *Remedia* is concerned with instructing a lover in means for extricating himself from a sensual entanglement, not with renouncing sensual love and commending religious piety.

In denouncing this conception of earthly love and in directing the thoughts of his pupil heavenward, the expositor provides something like a parallel to Chaucer's quasi-retraction. This parallelism I shall not press in detail. For likenesses in phraseology and in strands of thought I shall not argue; nor shall I undertake to show that Chaucer is under the direct influence of Andreas, here or elsewhere. In view of the wide distribution of the treatise *De Amore*, one is prepared to believe that Chaucer knew it, in Latin or in translation;²³ but I have in hand no proof of any such knowledge on his part. All that I venture to suggest is that what Andreas Capellanus did in his treatise upon courtly love helps to explain what Chaucer did in his courtly poem. We may now infer more confidently, perhaps, that in his disavowal the poet was incited in large measure by the amorous principles embodied in his story. If the expositor of the courtly system ends by directing our attention away from his code toward religious piety, Chaucer's turning from "love of kinde" toward "loves hete celestial" should, at the very least, seem more intelligible.

KARL YOUNG.

Yale University.

LAS CORTES DE LA MUERTE

In volume III of the *Obras de Lope de Vega* published by the Royal Spanish Academy, Menéndez y Pelayo inserted the *Auto de las Cortes de la Muerte* with its *loa*. He obtained the *auto* and *loa* from Justo de Sancha, editor of volume xxxv of the *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*, and concerning them he says: "Sobre su autoridad va nuestro texto, que en el original que él vió, no sabemos si manuscrito ó impreso, llevaba los nombres de Lope de Vega y del Dr. Mira de Amescua, el primero al frente del *auto*, el segundo al frente de la *loa*. No respondemos de tales atribuciones, pero de todos modos no hemos querido omitir una composición antigua é ingeniosa, por más que en nada acreciente la

²³ Concerning the distribution and influence of this treatise see Fauriel, p. 321; Paris, in *Romania*, Vol. XII, pp. 526-527; Rajna, pp. 193-272.

gloria de los dos ilustres poetas á quienes se ha prohijado.”¹ Professor Rennert in his *Life of Lope de Vega* includes the *auto* among the compositions by Lope,² and it is listed as doubtful in the *Vida de Lope de Vega* by Rennert and Castro.³ Since the *auto* was practically unknown until it was published in 1893, earlier cataloguers do not mention it.

In 1898 Professor Restori called attention to the fact that *Las Cortes de la Muerte* was not an original work, and from the scenes which he was able to identify showed that much of the *auto* was made up of extracts taken practically verbatim from three of Lope's *autos*, and from a *loa* and *entremés* which, though not by Lope, were performed in conjunction with certain of Lope's religious plays. Restori says that *Las Cortes de la Muerte* “non è che un mosaico di parecchie scene di Lope, interpolate con due scene delle quali soltanto non son riuscito identificare la provenienza. Esse sono: una *definizione d'Amore* (III, 600, 1, 1-53) che ha più del lirico che del drammatico, e colle *redondillas* del *Pecado* il lunghissimo *romance* del *Angel* (602, 1-604) il quale ha tutto il cattivo sapore delle imitazioni calderoniane.”⁴ He then cites the sources of the material which he was able to find. The scenes which he was able to identify were taken from the *autos* *Las aventuras del hombre*, *El tirano castigado*, and *El Pastor lobo* by Lope de Vega, from the *loa* preceding the *Fiesta novena del Sacramento* and from the *Entremés de la muestra de los carros*, the latter by Benavente, the former probably not by Lope. He continues: “Le due scene aggiunte saranno esse l'opera del Mira? A me pare impossibile che due autore simili, anche colla nessuna importanza che davano a queste scritture, e magari spinti dalla fretta di sovvenire qualche compagnia comica a corto di novetà (il Montalban ha un gustoso aneddoto in proposito), mettessero insieme questa non *collaborazione* ma informe e disonesta *contaminazione*. Anche la *loa* è un frammento che non mi pare del Mira.”⁵ Restori discovered that the *Cortes de la Muerte* was not

¹ *Obras de Lope de Vega publicadas por la Real Academia Española*, Madrid, 1890-1914, III, xxv.

² *Life of Lope de Vega*, Glasgow, 1904, p. 547.

³ *Vida de Lope de Vega*, Madrid, 1919, p. 528.

⁴ *Degli "Autos" di Lope de Vega Carpio*, Parma, 1898, p. xvii, note 2.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. xvii, note 2.

an original work. He felt reasonably certain that Lope and Mira did not have a hand in the composition of the *auto*, but his case, as far as he carried his investigations, is not as complete as one is led to believe by his statements. He claimed to have discovered practically all of the sources of the *auto*, while he has really overlooked much more than his remarks suggest. Moreover, he failed to call attention to the fact that all the borrowings which he discovered were from compositions printed in two volumes entitled *Fiestas del Santísimo Sacramento, repartidas en doce autos sacramentales, con sus loas y entremeses*⁶ and *Navidad y Corpus Christi festejados por los mejores ingenios de España*.⁷ In the former all the compositions were apparently supposed to be from Lope's pen. In order to prove conclusively that Lope was not responsible for *Las Cortes de la Muerte* it is obviously necessary to determine whether any of the passages in the *auto* have been taken from the works of authors other than Lope. The two scenes which Restori cited as coming from compositions not by Lope are not of major significance, because the *loa* and the *entremés* from which they were extracted form, as it were, an integral part of the *autos* with which they were performed.

As Restori has left matters it is possible to consider the *Auto de las Cortes de la Muerte* as a pot-pourri hastily put together by, or with the permission of, Lope and Mira to meet the urgent needs of a company of actors. The discovery of the following additional sources seems, however, definitely to clear up the matter. The *loa* which precedes the *auto* is not by Mira. It is taken entire, 92 verses, from the *Loa de la comedia de la perseguida Amaltea* by Francisco Tárrega, first published in *Doce comedias famosas de cuatro poetas naturales de . . . Valencia*.⁸ The change in assonance after verse 44 is due to the fact that the borrower has passed over 94 verses of the original text. The scene in which *Pecado* figures, 69 verses (III, 602)⁹ has been taken from the *Auto del Caballero del Febo* by Francisco de Rojas.¹⁰ Again the irregu-

⁶ Madrid, Zaragoza, 1644. Described by Barrera, *Catálogo*, p. 458.

⁷ Madrid, 1664. Described by Barrera, *Catálogo*, pp. 709, 710.

⁸ Valencia, 1608. Cf. Barrera, *Catálogo*, p. 677.

⁹ Volume and page reference to *Obras de Lope de Vega publicadas por la Real Academia Española*, Madrid, 1890-1914.

¹⁰ First published in *Navidad y Corpus Christi*, Madrid, 1664.

larity of versification is explained by the omission of 39 verses of the original. The song in *redondillas* (III, 607) which begins *Vela, vela, pecador* is taken from the *auto* entitled *Nuestra Señora del Rosario, la Madrina del Cielo* by Tirso de Molina.¹¹ One *redondilla* has been omitted. The long scene, 169 verses, in which the *Angel* figures (III, 602-604), occurs in the *auto* *La Gran Casa de Austria y divina Margarita* by Agustín Moreto.¹² The words are spoken in the last scene by Margarita. One of the *autos* by Lope which Restori overlooked is *El Niño Pastor*.¹³ From it the compiler of the *Cortes* borrowed 43 verses: the lines in *romance* spoken by the *Niño* (III, 607) and the last words of the *Angel*, 9 verses in *romance*.

Of the remaining unidentified lines it has been impossible, in this country at least, to locate the originals of the scene in which *Cupido* figures, 48 verses in *redondillas*, and also the latter portion of the speech by *Locura*, 28 verses in *redondillas* preceded by 18 lines in *romance*. To these more important scenes can be added one *redondilla*¹⁴ and one *quintilla*.¹⁵ The unidentified lines total 103. Each of the foregoing longer scenes has certainly been borrowed from the works of other writers. The faultiness in composition is evidence of this fact. The *redondillas* spoken by *Cupido* are interrupted by a *quintilla*, and the *romance* verses in *e-a* in the scene in which *Locura* appears follow uninterruptedly upon *romance* lines in *o-o*, while they in turn are followed by *redondillas*. It is obviously true that the above-mentioned scenes have been copied from published works, and an examination of other *autos* and *loas* not available in the United States would doubtless reveal

¹¹ First published in *Navidad y Corpus Christi*.

¹² First published in *Navidad y Corpus Christi*.

¹³ First published in *Fiestas del Santísimo Sacramento*, Madrid, 1644.

¹⁴ Ahora conozco mi engaño
Y os suplico arrepentido
Me oigáis, Señor, condolido
De mi culpa y grave daño. (III, 607.)

¹⁵ No quiere, no, el Redentor
La muerte del pecador,
Sí que muera arrepentido,
Pues perdonar al vencido
Es gloria del vencedor. (III, 607.)

the remaining sources. Even the scene in which *Cupido* figures will in all probability be found in some *loa* or *auto*, although Restori felt that it is more lyric than dramatic. As a matter of fact, the *loa* entitled *Del Amor* by Agustín de Rojas contains verses which are in exactly the same spirit.¹⁶

The published works which are known to have furnished the material for *Las Cortes de la Muerte* appeared at various dates, and extend over a period from 1608 to 1664. If one were sufficiently concerned over the date of composition of the *auto* it is obvious that a date later than 1664 must be assigned to it. Restori deduced in an interesting way, and came to the conclusion that the date of composition is some time in the first part of the eighteenth century.¹⁷ But since the composition was unknown until about the middle of the last century, it seems quite as logical to consider it a work of the nineteenth century. However, the *auto* is a hoax, and should not merit our further consideration as a unified dramatic composition.

Obviously neither Lope nor Mira is guilty of the piece as it has been printed. Some one, for what purpose it is impossible to determine, exercised his ingenuity by taking extracts from four or more published works containing *autos* (three of these works have been cited) and formed an *auto* which he called *Las Cortes de la Muerte*.

Why the name of Mira de Amescua was added to that of Lope is a subject for conjecture only, for this author's works have apparently not been used. It does not seem possible, or even probable, that the unknown compiler possessed sufficient critical sense

¹⁶ Amor es un accidente,
es un caos, es confusión,
es un no ver, no entenderse,
es en el siglo un infierno,
es rabia, es la misma muerte
y es la mayor maravilla

de las maravillas siete: *Colección de entremeses, loas, bailes, jácaras y mojigangas desde fines del siglo XVI a mediados del XVIII ordenada por Don Emilio Cotarelo y Mori, Madrid, 1911, p. 370, no. 106.*

¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. xvii, note 2.

to realize that Mira resembled Lope more closely in his writings than any other of his contemporaries, and that his name would therefore serve well as that of a collaborator, for the compiler has made sudden changes in assonance, mingled *quintillas* with *redondillas*, and committed other atrocities with the verse, all of which confused and amazed Menéndez. The only other apparent justification for the use of Mira's name is the possibility that the *auto* mentioned earlier, *El Pastor lobo*, which was included in the *Fiestas del Santísimo Sacramento* is the same as a *suelto* (?) of the same name which is attributed to Mira de Amescua.¹⁸ One might then assume that the compiler of *Las Cortes de la Muerte* was familiar with this work of Mira, and linked his name with that of Lope, perhaps to suggest that the *auto* was the result of collaboration.

An interesting study could be made of what constitutes the essential elements of an *auto*. That Justo de Sancha and Menéndez y Pelayo could be so misled as to believe that *Las Cortes de la Muerte* is an *auto sacramental* in the style of Lope or Mira or both appears to be a manifest indication of the fact that the *auto* before Calderón's time cannot be said to possess a definite form in so far as versification and scene length are concerned, or to possess a content which can be determined or delimited. But that is not the point of the present article.

It has been demonstrated that *Las Cortes de la Muerte* with its *loa* was constructed by an unknown compiler, who assembled extracts taken from *autos*, *loas*, and one *entremés*, composed by Tárrega, Rojas, Tirso de Molina, Moreto, Benavente, Lope de Vega, and others. It is not the work of Lope, and should be removed from the list of *autos* attributed to him.

GEORGE IRVING DALE.

Washington University.

¹⁸ Cf. Barrera, *op. cit.*, pp. 260, 458.

AN HOLY MEDYTACION—BY LYDGATE?

It has not been observed, so far as I am aware, that the poem *An Holy Medytacion*, printed by Dr. MacCracken in his collection of Lydgate's Minor Poems,¹ is for the most part almost a verbal translation of a Latin poem, *De Humana Miseria Tractatus*, edited by M. Esposito² from ms. E. 2. 33 in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin—the only ms. so far as is known, which preserves the text of this poem. The Dublin ms. was written in the fifteenth century, but this Latin poem, as M. Esposito believes, was composed by an Englishman during the reign of Henry III. This *Treatise on Human Wretchedness* is a satirical poem; "in rhythm and substance it is an imitation of the celebrated *Apocalypsis Goliae*,"³ and it is immediately preceded in the Dublin ms. by the text of another *Goliae* poem, namely the *De Conjuge non Ducenda*.⁴ We may assume, then, without further argument that the Latin poem is much older than the fifteenth-century *Holy Medytacion*.

Inasmuch as both the Latin and English poems are easily accessible the reader who chooses to do so will have no difficulty in making detailed comparison of the two texts. As an illustration of the closeness with which the Middle English versifier followed his source, I cite the first four lines.

Post tempus horridum cessante pluia
Quo terra frigoris gaudet absentia
Vires recipiunt queque nascentia
Producunt arbores flores et folia.

After þe stormy tyme cesing þe rayn,
Whane for þabsence of colde þeorþe is fayn,
And þe qwyck thinges resceyue þeire vygour,
And trees bringen foorþe leeff and flour.

The translator, to be sure, allows himself here and there to omit

¹ *The Minor Poems of John Lydgate*, Part I, EETS, Ext. Ser. cvii, 43-48.

² "A Thirteenth-Century Rhythmus," *English Historical Review*, xxxii (1917), 400-405.

³ M. Esposito, *loc. cit.*, p. 401.

⁴ Ed. T. Wright, *Poems of W. Mapes*, Camd. Soc., pp. 77-85. For references to the numerous mss. of this poem see M. Esposito's note.

or to expand the phrases of his original. Lines 42, 43, for example, which represent the denunciation of the flesh which follows as inspired by God, have no counterpart in the Latin. Again, lines 63-66 and 69-72 are expansions introduced in the English text. In general, however, the first 73 lines of the English poem are a fairly close rendering of the first 60 lines of the Latin original.

At this point the first significant variation appears. The English poet, who was writing with a didactic rather than a satiric purpose, inserts a passage of some length (vv. 74-110) descriptive of the joys of heaven and the torments of hell. At v. 111 the translator turns back to his source, and from this point to v. 166 he gives us a somewhat freer paraphrase of vv. 61-91 in the Latin text. The only changes of moment are the insertion of didactic amplifications, such as vv. 115-118, 134-146, and 154-156.

But with v. 166 all parallels to the Latin text suddenly cease. The translator concludes his poem by a conventional homiletic appeal to his reader to repent, confess, and make satisfaction for his sins, and thus come to the bliss of heaven. The Latin poem proceeds in quite another vein to indulge in satire on the power of money, especially in the court of Rome:

Roma que capud est orbis, ut dicitur
Mater cupidinis palam efficitur.

A comparison of the two poems, therefore, affords an interesting example of the process by which a thirteenth-century satire was transformed in the fifteenth century into *An Holy Medytacion*.

Now that we recognize the source of the English poem, we may proceed to re-examine the evidence on which it has been assigned to Lydgate. The first 20 lines, with their picture of the renewal of Nature in the Springtide, may possibly have been regarded as a reminiscence of the opening lines of the Prologue to the *Canterbury Tales*, and therefore may have lent color to the view that they were written by Chaucer's disciple, the Monk of Bury. At least I will acknowledge that in my own mind this fancied resemblance had its influence in considering the question of Lydgate's authorship. But with the Latin source before us, it is clear that the author of the English verses was not echoing Chaucer. Indeed, as the case now stands, the Springtide picture, so

far as it has any bearing on the question of authorship, counts against Lydgate instead of in his favor. For it is reasonable to suppose that if Lydgate had been translating this Latin poem he would have been reminded so forcibly of Chaucer's Prologue that in rendering

Per prata redolet	mira suauitas
Virgulta uoluerum	replet garulitas

he would not have been able to keep out some of Chaucer's phrases.

Moreover, the *Holy Medytacion* is composed in couplets, instead of in the stanza forms which Lydgate employed almost exclusively for his shorter poems. Indeed, in the collection of his Minor Poems published by Dr. MacCracken, this is the solitary instance of a poem written in couplets. In view of this departure from Lydgate's established usage, strong evidence would seem to be required to establish his claim to this poem.

When we examine the evidence from the manuscripts we find but slender support for the tradition of Lydgatean authorship. The *Holy Medytacion* is preserved in only two mss.—both of them written by John Shirley. In Trinity College ms. R. 3. 20 (No. 600 in Dr. James's Catalogue) the poem stands between Chaucer's *Compleynthe of Anelida* and Occleve's *Letter of Cupid*, without any indication of its authorship. But in ms. Ashmole 59 it appears with the following heading: "Here nowe foloweþe an holy medytacion made by þe Religious man Lidegate Daun Johan, þe munk of Bury." This ascription is the sole testimony in favor of Lydgate's authorship; how much confidence can we place in it? "This Ashmole manuscript," declares Miss Hammond,⁵ "though written by Shirley's own hand, is inferior to the Trinity College and British Museum volumes transcribed by him. Many of its copies, as already pointed out (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, Feb., 1904, p. 36), are hasty, garbled, and scramblingly written; and this carelessness of execution furnishes one reason, as I have above mentioned, for selecting the Trinity College text of a poem in preference to the Ashmole text." The explanation for this Miss Hammond finds in the fact that Shirley transcribed the Ashmole ms. after the year 1447, when he was upwards of eighty years of age.

⁵ *Anglia*, xxvii, 397.

Moreover, in Ashmole 59 we find expressly ascribed to Lydgate two other poems which are universally rejected from the Lydgate canon: (1) A macaronic prayer to the Blessed Virgin (fol. 21^b) and (2) "Quia amore langueo" (fol. 66^a).

Finally, it may be observed, if we turn to the text of the poem itself, we find several instances of "penultimate or antepenultimate rhyme of words in -oun"—one of the tests employed by Dr. MacCracken⁶ in distinguishing spurious from genuine Lydgatean verse. Thus, *mutácyoun: consolácyoun* (19, 20), *affécción: cor-récción* (41, 42), and *afféccyoun: dyléccyoun* (143, 144).

Neither external nor internal evidence, therefore, appears to give valid ground for assigning the *Holy Medytacion* to the Monk of Bury. But I can not feel that in removing this poem from his canon we are seriously impairing the lustre of Lydgate's poetic laurels.

CARLETON BROWN.

Bryn Mawr College.

BITTER BEER-DRINKING.

In the Old English *Andreas*, after the hero has been imprisoned the fourth time by the pagans, he addresses an ancient pillar, commanding it to send forth a flood against his tormentors; whereupon (Root's translation, ll. 1528-35),

Water deeply stirred
Seized on the earth; the host was sore dismayed
At terror of the flood; the youths were doomed,
And perished in the deep; the rush of war
Snatched them away with terror of the sea.
*That was a grievous trouble, bitter beer;
The ready cupbearers did not delay—
From daybreak on, each man had drink to spare.*

The word here translated "beer" is, in the original, rather a "receiving or taking of beer," and hence, as Kennedy renders it, a beer-feast (*bēorþegu*; cf. the *winþegu* of *Dan.* 17; *Gifts of Men* 74).

⁶ *Minor Poems of Lydgate*, p. vii; cf. also *Anglia*, xxxiii, 284.

Clearly it was an experience—the experience of drowning—that the poet sought to characterize as bitter. It was a psychical reaction, not a physical sensation, that was uppermost in his mind. If, in the employment of his figure, he was thinking of bitter beer as unpleasant, it might be argued that the normal beer of that period, presumably agreeable, was not bitter. Such a conclusion would seem to be in harmony with the view of the best authorities that hops were hardly known in England before the sixteenth century, when they probably came in from the Low Countries (see the *New Eng. Dict.* under *ale*, *beer*, and *hop*). It is true that Hoops maintains (*Reallæxikon* 1. 280) that bitter herbs were employed from the earliest times in the Teutonic territories to impart their flavor to beer; but he makes no specific statement of this sort with reference to England. Moreover, the first mention of the growing of hops in Northern Europe belongs to the year 768 (Hoops, *op. cit.*, p. 282), and concerns France alone; this can hardly have affected England in any way, certainly not by the time that *Andreas* was written.

In translations from the Bible, *bēor* is several times employed to render Latin *sicera*,¹ itself from Greek *σίκερα*, adapted from *shēkār*, the Hebrew word for "strong drink." Thus the words *wīn* and *bēor* are used to translate *vinum* and *sicera* in Deut. 14. 26; 29. 6; Lk. 1. 15.² In the Vulgate, *shēkār* and *σίκερα* are not always rendered, however, by Latin *sicera*; thus in Isa. 24. 9 these words are translated by *potio*. I conceive this verse, Isa. 24. 9, to have been in the mind of the author of *Andreas* (Bishop Acca?) when he wrote line 1533. The Latin and the Greek are:³

¹ From this word comes English *cider*, modified from earlier *sicer* (still found in 1582 in the Douay version of Lk. 1. 15).

² *Ealu* is added to *bēor* in Ælfric, *Hom.* 2. 38, and substituted for it in Judg. 13. 4; *Bl. Hom.*, p. 165.

³ The A. V. translates: "They shall not drink wine with a song; *strong drink shall be bitter to them that drink it.*"

With this verse compare Eccles. 31. 39 (29): "Amaritudo animæ vinum multum potatum"; or, in English: "Wine drunken with excess maketh bitterness of the mind." A more critical rendering is that by Charles, in his edition of the Apocrypha: "Headache, derision, and dishonor is wine drunk in strife and vexation."

The preceding verse is (Isa. 24. 8): "Cessavit gaudium tympanorum, quieuit sonitus lætantium, conticuit dulcedo citharæ" (cf. Isa. 5. 12),

Cum cantico non bibent vinum; amara erit potio bibentibus illam.

. . . ; πικρὸν ἐγένετο τὸ σίκερα τοῖς πίνουσιν.

A similar idea to that of the line in *Andreas* occurs in *Gu.* 540-2:⁴

þæt hē bibūgan mæge þone bitran drync
þone Eve fyrr Adame geaf,
byrelade brȳd geong.

In the Old High German *Ludwigslied* (53-4) of 881 there is an

the A. V. having: "The mirth of tabrets ceaseth, the noise of them that rejoice endeth, the joy of the harp ceaseth." With the last clause may be compared the *hearpan wyn* of *Beow.* 2262, which is immediately followed by the equivalent kenning, *gomen glēobēames*. On this coinage may then be based the *hearpan wynne*, *gomenwudu grētte* of *Beow.* 2107-8, and the *gomenwudu* of *Beow.* 1065. All these characterizations of the harp and its sweetness may, then, come ultimately from Isaiah (curiously enough, *hearpan wyn* represents the Hebrew, rather than the Latin), and are in turn appropriated by Cynewulf (*Chr.* 670, *glēobēam grētan*) and the author of *Gifts of Men* (50 *glēobēames*). (It may be observed that, from the beginning of this chapter, Isaiah is describing the signs of a day of judgment, and that it is a mournful condition which is depicted in *Beow.* 2249^b-2266).

⁴ Kennedy translates (*The Poems of Cynewulf*, p. 289): "Nor was there any man in that noble race ever again so eager in the will of God, so wise of heart) that he might shun that bitter drink which of old Eve gave unto Adam, which the young bride poured out." With this compare the much longer passage, *Gu.* 953-964 (Kennedy, *op. cit.*, pp. 292-3: "The drink was now at hand that Eve brewed for Adam in the beginning of the world. The fiend first served it to the woman, and she then poured out that bitter potion [lit. cup] to Adam, her well-loved man, whose children have grimly made requital [rather, paid tribute] for that olden deed; so that from the beginning there has not been a man on earth, nor one of human race, who might shield himself, or shun the livid draught of Death's deep cup."

Over against the bitter cup of death we may place the cup of heavenly life, or of heavenly knowledge, with which St. Cuthbert and his friend Herebert refreshed each other: Bede, *Eccl. Hist.* 4. 29: "Qui dum sese alterutrum cælestis vitæ poculis debriarent," where the Old English has (ed. Miller, p. 370): "Ðā hīe ȝā . . . him betwih bādwēg scencton þæs heofenlican lifes." Here Bede's life of Cuthbert reads (chap. 28), "cælestis sapientiæ poculis." Cf. Ps. 116. 13, "the cup of salvation" (*calicem salutaris*).

apparent imitation of the passage in *Andreas* (Braune, *Althochdeutsches Lesebuch*, 7th ed., p. 151):

Her skaneta cehanton sinan fianton
Bitteres lides.⁵

ALBERT STANBURROUGH COOK.

Yale University.

AN OVIDIAN PROTOTYPE OF A CHARACTER IN *WILHELM MEISTER*

Some fifteen years ago, under the stimulus of a conviction that Goethe scholars had devoted a too exclusive attention to *Faust* and that the other great work, which had occupied the poet almost as long, had fallen into an undeserved neglect, there were published two important books dealing with the genesis of *Wilhelm Meister*: Eugen Wolff, *Mignon*, 1909, and Hans Berendt, *Goethes Wilhelm Meister*, 1911. The discovery of the *Theatralische Sendung* in 1910 might have been expected to add a fresh impetus to this reawakening of interest in Goethe's novel.

Wolff, who laid stress especially upon literary influences, produced evidence which seemed to show a considerable indebtedness of Goethe to Lucian's *Dialogues* for the *milieu* and characters of the theatrical world described in the novel. A colloquy between mother and daughter, in which the girl is admonished to bestow her favors upon a rich lover instead of upon his impecunious rival, is believed by Wolff to have suggested the situation of Mariane between Norberg and Wilhelm, with the part of the worldly wise mother taken by Barbara, the old "Sibyl" who acts as Mariane's servant and confidante. This hypothesis is weakened by the consideration that Wieland's translation of Lucian, which would have made him easily accessible to Goethe, did not appear until 1788, ten years after the completion of the First Book of the

⁵ In the Old Saxon *Heliand*, *lith* is found eight times (126, 2013, 2016, 2025, 2050, 2055, 2063, 5651), in the rendering of Lk. 1. 15; Jn. 2. 3 ff.; Mt. 27. 48 (Mk. 15. 36). Gothic *leithus* translates *sicera* in Lk. 1. 15. Besides being occasionally used in prose, Old English *lǣ* occurs in *lǣwæge*, can or cup of strong drink, *Beow.* 1982 (cf. *ealowæge*, *Beow.* 481, 496, 2021).

Theatralische Sendung, which already contained the Wilhelm-Mariane-Barbara situation in all its essential features.

This very situation is to be found, however, in another classical writer, who may fairly be called a favorite author of Goethe's, namely, in Ovid. The *Metamorphoses* is among the books mentioned in *Dichtung und Wahrheit* as having occupied an important place in Goethe's early reading. The student took it with him to Strassburg, where he was much perturbed by Herder's attack upon his favorite, and both the *Wanderjahre* and the Second Part of *Faust* bear witness to his continued interest. The motto under the caption *Zweiter Römischer Aufenthalt* of the *Italienische Reise* is a quotation from the *Fasti*, and the elegiac mood which accompanied his departure from Rome recalled to Goethe's mind a passage from the *Tristia*. The epigram *Ferne*, addressed to Frau von Stein and written in 1782, was inspired by the *Heroïdes*, and the classic beauty of the *Römische Elegien* owes much to a conscientious study, together with other models, of Ovid, the greatest master of the elegiac measure in Latin literature.

In the *Amores* of Ovid, the eighth elegy of the First Book deals with the *lena*, or bawd, a type borrowed from Comedy, where it had originally been developed. This poem is by a German editor¹ appropriately superscribed *Kuppelcatechismus*. The poet, concealed in the apartment of his mistress, is a scandalized witness of the bawd's nefarious attempt to profane their modest *liaison*. I quote from Professor Showerman's translation,² with some abridgements and paraphrases to save space.

The bawd to the lady: "Know you, my light, that yesterday you won the favor of a wealthy youth? Caught fast, he could not take his eyes from your face. And why should you not win favor? Second to none is your beauty. Ah me, apparel worthy of your person is your lack! I could wish you as fortunate as you are most fair—for with you become rich, I shall not be poor. A rich lover has desired you; he has interest in your needs. . . .

"It may be that the ladies of olden time confined their favors to one man, but now 'tis Venus rules in the city of her Aeneas.

¹ *P. Ovidi Nasonis Amorum libri tres, erklärt von Paul Brandt*, Leipzig, 1911, 1. Abt., p. 60.

² *Ovid, Heroïdes and Amores, with an English translation by Grant Showerman*, London and New York, 1914, p. 349 ff.

Nowadays beautiful ladies divert themselves; chaste is she whom no one has asked—, or, be she not too countrified, she herself asks first. . . .

"Think, what does your fine poet give you besides fresh verses? You will get many thousands of lover's lines to read. Let him who will give be greater for you than great Homer; believe me, there is genius in giving too. Do not look down upon the rich lover because he is of humble birth, nor let yourself be deluded by the good family of the other. Take thy grandfathers and go, thou lover who art poor! Nor is there harm in pretended love; allow your gallant to think he is loved, and take care lest this love bring you nothing in. Let your tongue aid you, and cover up your thoughts—wheedle while you despoil."

The poem ends with a vigorous imprecation pronounced by the poet on the head of the old beldam, with her sparse white hair, her eyes lachrymose from wine, and her wrinkled cheeks. "May the gods give you no abode and helpless age, and long winters and everlasting thirst."

The parallel will seem sufficiently close to one who recalls the First Book of the *Lehrjahre*. Barbara, like Ovid's *Iena*, prefers the rich lover to the poor, and uses all her influence with Mariane in Norberg's behalf. She, likewise, views the situation with an eye single to material advantage for herself and her mistress, and is not at a loss for pragmatic arguments to fortify her counsels. Norberg is shrewd enough not to forget her in his gifts, and Barbara has the same contempt for the penniless *dilettante* Wilhelm as the classic bawd for the poet-lover. The resemblance extends to the bibulousness which is a vice common to both hags.

On the other hand, Barbara is unmistakably a character with an individuality of her own, vividly sketched, plastically modelled, a classical counterpart to Frau Marthe in *Faust*, who betrays a kinship with the familiar figure of "die alt Kupplerin" in Hans Sachs. The art which created Barbara has been praised by many critics, from Friedrich Schlegel down.

And if the situation is similar, how different is the treatment! It is unnecessary to emphasize the futility of applying a moral yardstick to Ovid. The *Amores* are not love poems at all, in our sense. They are a poetical exercise, a study *ἐν τοῖς ἐρωτικοῖς* in the Alexandrian tradition, without genuine feeling or real passion. They are charming, witty, cynical, ironic, with the Latin *malice*

which found its most characteristic expression among writers of our time in Anatole France. Yet for all its classic perfections of form, the frigid obscenities of Ovid's poem are repugnant to modern taste. How differently are we affected by the moving history of Mariane and Wilhelm, Goethe's "geliebtes dramatisches Ebenbild!"³ One may compare for example the corresponding scenes in which the lovers are disillusioned. Ovid, with ingenious irony, makes himself the hidden observer of the bawd's artifices practised upon his all too willing mistress, so that he is compelled to hear his rival praised and himself contemned, yet is prevented by circumstances from giving vent to his righteous indignation. This is a tragicomic situation, and the poet makes the most of its comic possibilities. Now Goethe too ironizes his hero (as with Ovid a poetical image of himself), particularly in the later conception of the *Lehrjahre*, but in a spirit exactly opposite to Ovid's. What tragic irony in Wilhelm's transports of happy love, to be followed abruptly by the catastrophe of the discovery! Ovid's irony is cruel and cold, Goethe's is blended with a tender pity for the guileless youth whose pure passion is so grossly and brutally betrayed. The fervor of diction and the prose rhythms of *Werther* are echoed in the closing scene of this tragedy of love:

"Und ihre Gestalt. . . Er verlor sich im Andenken an sie, seine Ruhe ging in Verlangen über, er umfasste einen Baum, kühlte seine heisse Wange an der Rinde, und die Winde der Nacht saugten begierig den Hauch auf, der aus dem reinen Busen bewegt hervordrang. Er fühlte nach dem Halstuch, das er von ihr mitgenommen hatte, es war vergessen, es steckte im vorigen Kleide. Seine Lippen lechzten, seine Glieder zitterten vor Verlangen.

"Die Musik hörte auf, und es war ihm, als wär' er aus dem Elemente gefallen, in dem seine Empfindungen bisher emporgetragen wurden. Seine Unruhe vermehrte sich, da seine Gefühle nicht mehr von den sanften Tönen genährt und gelindert wurden.

³ Calling attention to this fundamental difference of conception does not imply a desire to hold Ovid up to public execration as a monster of vice nor to exalt Goethe as a paragon of virtue in such matters. Certainly there are few poets in whose case such an invidious comparison would be more absurd. It is a curious fact that Goethe's suppressed poem, *Das Tagebuch* (cf. Werke, Weimar Ed., 2. Abt. v, 345 ff.) deals frankly with the same subject as *Amores* III, vii, the only one of Ovid's poems which Professor Showerman felt constrained to omit from his translation.

Ersetzte sich auf ihre Schwelle nieder und war schon mehr beruhigt. Er küsste den messingenen Ring, womit man an ihre Türe pochte, er küsste die Schwelle, über die ihre Füße aus und ein gingen, und erwärmte sie durch das Feuer seiner Brust. Dann sass er wieder eine Weile stille und dachte sie hinter ihren Vorhängen, im weissen Nachtkleide, mit dem roten Band um den Kopf, in süsser Ruhe, und dachte sich selbst so nahe zu ihr hin, dass ihm vorkam, sie müsste nun von ihm träumen. Seine Gedanken waren lieblich, wie die Geister der Dämmerung; Ruhe und Verlangen wechselten in ihm, die Liebe lief mit schauernder Hand über alle Saiten seiner Seele; es war, als wenn der Gesang der Sphären über ihm stille stünde, um die leisen Melodien seines Herzens zu belauschen."

Nothing, surely, could be less Ovidian than that.

F. STANTON CAWLEY.

Harvard University.

REVIEWS

Il Filostrato by GIOVANNI BOCCACCIO, translated into English verse by HUBERTIS CUMMINGS. The Princeton Press, Princeton, N. J., 1924.

Twice before has Boccaccio's *Filostrato* been translated into a foreign language, once into French prose in the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century by Pierre de Beauvais, Seneschal of Anjou, in his *Troilus*, published by Moland and D'Héricault, in *Nouvelles françoises en prose du XIV Siècle* in *Bibliothèque Elzévirienne*, Paris, 1858, and once into German verse in the nineteenth century by Karl Freiherr von Beaulieu Marconnay in his *Troilus und Kressida*, Berlin, A. Hofmann, 1884. This third translation of the poem by Professor Cummings is, save for the paraphrase of a considerable portion by Chaucer, the first in English.

The translator has preferred a metrical form for a metrical original, although, unlike Beaulieu, who retained the *ottava rima* of the Italian, he has chosen, as more suitable to his English, to substitute an alexandrine in place of a pentameter in the final verse of each stanza, following therein the practice of Spenser.

By presenting the *Filostrato* in metrical dress Professor Cum-

mings has performed the useful service of helping to reveal the author, who is at present known mainly by the prose *Decameron*, in his no less noteworthy character as poet. For to Boccaccio belongs the credit of having in the *Filostrato*—and later in the *Teseide*—been the first to turn to literary account the popular verse measure of his day known as the *ottava rima*, which afterwards became in the hands of Ariosto and Tasso the standard meter of Italian epic. Furthermore, the variety of other verse forms which he has used in the *Ameto*, the *Amorosa Visione*, and the *Canzoni* abundantly attests his right to the title of poet.

To the task of providing a metrical rendering of the *Filostrato* Cummings has brought not only a scholarly knowledge of his author, amply reviewed in his doctoral dissertation, *The Indebtedness of Chaucer's Works to the Italian Works of Boccaccio* (University of Cincinnati Studies, 1916), but also a native delicacy and refinement of feeling far more essential than scholarly apparatus to the difficult task of translating from the poetry of one language into that of another. In particular, aesthetic sensibilities of a high order were needed to couch in an idiom as rugged and essentially masculine as English that exquisitely faint and fugitive aroma, so largely dependent upon a feminine fineness of phraseology distinctively Italian, which distinguishes this poem above the other works of its author. In the accomplishment of this signal achievement the translator has drawn to his aid the eminently appropriate archaisms of French derivation used by Chaucer, such as *joyaunce*, *pleasaunce*, *gentillesse*, *noblesse*, etc. By virtue of this happy expedient as well as by the fidelity with which he has adhered to the complicated rhyme scheme of the Italian, Cummings has succeeded to a high degree in reproducing the spirit of his original. While allowing himself the freedom indispensable to metrical translation, he has not, as Pope in the *Iliad*, made of the *Filostrato* in any sense a new poem after his own tastes. If, as Mathew Arnold says, the first duty of the translator be to produce upon the mind of his reader the same impression that the author he is translating produced upon the mind of the reader (or auditor) of his own day, we can, in so far as it is possible to judge from our own standpoint, make no doubt of the success of the translation. To the general impression of facile

and graceful artistry conveyed by the volume as a whole the handsome type and page provided by the Princeton Press contribute conspicuously. This harmony between the content and the format of the volume should recommend it strongly to the lover and collector of books.

It must be confessed, however, that to the scholar Cummings' translation will prove less valuable than to the amateur. There is, in the first place, room to doubt whether, as Cummings hopes in his preface, the translation can be of any great assistance to the Chaucerian scholar anxious to make an exact comparison of the language of the English with that of the Italian poet. No doubt the student of Chaucer will at times wish to know the general content of the *Filostrato* that he may discover what portions Chaucer has utilized and what changes, if any, of a broad and outstanding character he has made in these portions. This he can readily do from reading Cummings' translation. But if his object be the finer one of delicate phraseological comparison, his attempts will be to a large extent baffled. Undoubtedly such a close literal rendering as would provide opportunity for this minute phraseological comparison is largely, if not wholly, precluded by the choice on the part of the translator of a metrical rendering. One cannot well in such a case kill two birds with one stone. Certainly for the general reader, anxious merely to obtain a faithful reproduction of the spirit of the poem in a smooth and artistic translation, a literary rendering would have proved less welcome than the far more difficult and ambitious achievement that Professor Cummings has so well executed. But while the translator should not be held to task for not having provided what was excluded by his design, it must be acknowledged that he is not always careful to reproduce accurately the exact meaning of his original. This defect will frequently cause embarrassment not only to the Chaucerian student, but also to the student of Italian literature. In a number of cases he either misses or, in his search for a striking and harmonious English equivalent, misrepresents the sense now of single words and now of whole clauses in the Italian. To limit the unwelcome and seemingly invidious task of citing examples to a single instance of each kind, we may notice Cummings' rendering of the Italian *accorta* (canto I, stanza 11, verse 7) as

"dainty and lissom." Certainly the word *accorto*, which is, by the way, a favorite adjective of the author in personal descriptions, occurring again I, 19, 8, II, 28, 1, and 71, 7, IV, 19, 6 and 50, 5, is not covered or touched in meaning by either or both of the English adjectives used by Cummings, and means a mental, not a physical attribute, here perhaps "discerning." An example of an erroneous rendering of an entire clause is furnished by the translation of canto I, stanza 28, verses 1-3. Here the Italian, according to the edition of Moutier, Florence, 1831, which is presumably that used by the translator, runs as follows:

Piacque quell atto a Troilo, al tornare
Ch' ella fe' in sè, alquanto sdegnosetto,
Quasi dicesse: non ci si può stare?

Cummings here translates as follows:

Which graceful gesture pleased young Troilo,
So in the movement showed her dainty pride,—
As if she said: "May not a wight stand so?"—

The error here lies both in the meaning and in the construction of the clause beginning "al tornare" and ending "fe' in sè." *Tornare in sè* means "to recover one's composure," the reference being backward to the words *donnesca altezza* of the preceding stanza, and the idea expressed in the construction *al* followed by the infinitive is that of temporal sequence, which in English would have to be rendered by a clause consisting of "upon" followed by the verbal noun or "once" followed by the past tense. Accordingly the whole clause would have to be translated, "Upon recovering" or "once she had recovered her composure," etc. This passage is of peculiar interest from the standpoint, above indicated, of comparison with Chaucer, since it is one that the English poet undertook to reproduce, but either failed to understand or did not care to take the trouble to render accurately, and thus missed one of the finest psychological touches in the Italian.

It is, moreover, to be regretted, both from the standpoint of the scholar and from that of the general reader, that Professor Cummings should not have seen fit to include the *Proemio* in his translation. In this document, which is in prose and which is addressed by the author to his lady, Maria d'Aquino, Boccaccio re-

veals the occasion that prompted the composition of the poem that follows. He here explains to his *nobilissima donna* that he was led to the composition of the *Filostrato* by the fact that she had recently left Naples for Sannio, and that, being plunged thereby into the deepest distress, he had determined to give vent to his sorrow in song and to have recourse for that purpose to the ancient story of the love-lorn Troilus as furnishing an apt parallel to his own case. But, as he is careful to add, the excellent lady Maria must guard against the error of applying to herself all the implications of the antique fable. For not only must not the poet dare to hope that such bliss will ever be his as came to Troilus in the full possession of Cressida, but more particularly he warns his lady against the folly of supposing that he could have the temerity to imply that she would ever become as faithless to him as Cressida became to Troilus. These declarations of the author in the *Proemio* are of the utmost value in enabling us to determine the stage reached by the poet in his courtship of Maria at the time that the *Filostrato* was written, as well as the chronological position occupied by the poem among the other juvenile romances of Boccaccio, in which, as is well known, he alludes in one fashion or another to his love for this lady. Thus it is evident from the tone of despair in which he remonstrates with his innamorata because of her departure from Naples that he had already made considerable headway in his courtship. From this it may be inferred that the poem was written after the earlier portion of the *Filocolo*, in which he describes his first sight of Maria in the temple and his subsequent talk with her in the convent, in the course of which he received from her a commission to write that earliest of his romances. It is likewise clear from the two caveats added by the author to warn his lady against taking to herself the further implications of the Trojan story that the poem was written both before he had, by means of a nocturnal surprise, stolen from her the final favors and before he had been deserted by her for another lover. From this it may be inferred that the poem was written before the *Ameto* and before the later portion of the *Filocolo*, in both of which express reference is made to these subsequent events. In other words, we may say that the *Filostrato*

was written after Boccaccio had become well acquainted with Maria, but before he had gained full possession of her person, and while he was, despite the purely conventional demurrer of the *Proemio*, living in high hopes of the eventual gratification of his desires. This evidently critical phase in the relation of the poet to Maria at the time has, furthermore, an important bearing upon the character of the poem itself. In no other of his works has Boccaccio reached the high level of fervent eloquence that appears in the *Filostrato*. He uses a language of exalted passion, fraught with echoes of the *Vita Nuova* of Dante and other specimens of the *dolce stil nuovo*, both in addressing his lady in the *Proemio* and also, not infrequently, in his representation of the grief of Troilus at the departure of Cressida. We have accordingly, alike from this elevated language and from the explicit statements of the *Proemio*, every reason to believe that the *Filostrato* was written when its author was on the rising tide of a passion that was sweeping him ever nearer to the object of his heart's desire. For these several reasons it cannot be too strongly emphasized that the *Proemio* should always be read in connection with the *Filostrato*, to which it furnishes the key and of which it was intended by the author to serve as an inseparable part. Furthermore, the inclusion of the *Proemio*, in which constant reference is made to the absence of Maria from Naples, would have saved the translator from making in his note (p. 189) the mistake of supposing that the *Filostrato* may have been written in Florence.

NATHANIEL E. GRIFFIN.

University of Pennsylvania.

-
- Studien zum Bedeutungswandel im Deutschen*, II, von E. WELLANDER. Uppsala Universidets Årsskrift, 1923. vii + 187 pp.
- Einführung in die Bedeutungslehre*, von H. SPERBER. Bonn und Leipzig, 1923. iv + 96 pp.

In the extremely difficult subject of defining and circumscribing semantic phenomena probably no one has done more in recent years than Wellander. His *Studien zum Bedeutungswandel*, I,

appearing in 1917, was generally acknowledged as holding a place next in importance to the works of Paul¹ and Wundt.² Following in the main Paul's logical rather than Wundt's psychological conception of development of meaning he yet was able to clarify obscurities in both and to suggest new points of view for the treatment and classification of semantic material. The above work is a continuation of this study of almost equal length but scarcely of equal importance. This is not because the author has not acquitted himself equally well of his task, but rather because the subject-matter has yielded fewer positive results from the standpoint of semantics.

Wellander takes up the study of the syntactical ellipsis in the German language with the object of determining its semantic significance. In this he sets himself the task of collecting, defining and classifying the numerous cases of omission (of word, phrase, or clause), and of determining, in as far as possible, the sources of and the reasons for the omissions. In opposition to the view usually taken by writers on syntax, Wellander does not consider every case of omission as representing some type of ellipsis. In his first chapter he discusses the various types of non-elliptical omissions. In this the most important in its bearing on the study of semantics is what he terms "semantically determined word-reduction" (*semasiologisch bedingte Wortreduktion*). This is what Paul (*Prinzipien*, § 62) and others have generally called *specialization of meaning*. For example: *Schirm* 'protection' to *Schirm* 'umbrella' is usually explained simply as a case of specialization of meaning. For Wellander, however, it is not merely a question of semantics but first a morphological problem of the suppression of one member of a compound word, in this case *Regenschirm*. It is the suppression of one member of the compound that brings about the semantic change for the part not suppressed. The word *Schirm* would never have had the meaning 'umbrella,' if the word *Regen* had not at one time associated itself with it and limited its meaning. One cannot, therefore, speak of a specialization of meaning, as if this were a matter of several stages of narrowing. The special meaning is there the

¹ Paul, *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*.

² Wundt, *Völkerpsychologie. Die Sprache*, II.

moment the limiting word is used. The limiting word is left out and the simple form at once assumes the meaning of the compound. But while Wellander lists this type among the non-elliptical omissions, he is himself in doubt as to whether it might not also be a form of his second type of ellipsis (see below). He freely admits, however, his inability definitely to classify many forms of omission, so that numerous examples are found as illustrations of two or more types.

Ellipsis he defines as the partial or complete omission of the common element in two corresponding syntactical constructions. He differs from other writers on syntax in regarding it not as the result of a completed syntactical process "als Ergebnis eines abgeschlossenen Processes," but as a syntactical function. Not the omission itself is the important fact, but the processes causing this omission. Ellipses are of two types: (1) the two members combine forming a loose syntactical construction but without a corresponding semantic union; (2) the members combine forming a close syntactical union with more or less unified meaning. The first of these types does not, for the most part, affect the development of meaning, which makes the work of more importance syntactically than semantically. And yet it is easy to understand why the author had to include it in a comprehensive outline of the ellipsis. A discussion of the second type of ellipsis, which is of especial importance for semantic development, is promised us for the near future and will no doubt constitute Part III of the studies. Judging from the keen analysis, the thoroughness and originality characterizing the first two parts, we may expect a valuable contribution to semantic study in what is to follow.

Sperber's work purports to be an introduction to the study of semantics. His object is not to build up a complete system, but rather to indicate certain methods of approach to the subject. Students of semantics familiar with his former works and articles will recognize in this study rather a restatement and résumé of his contributions to semantics, than any new matter of importance. Some ten years ago he published his most important contribution: *Über den Affekt als Ursache der Sprachveränderung* (Halle, 1914). In this he sets up the thesis that changes in meaning come about thru one cause and only one, viz. *feeling* (Affekt).

Ideas proper are not active principles capable of calling forth changes in themselves, such principles are, however, a part of the emotions accompanying ideas. A word in a certain combination becomes "surcharged with feeling" (*affektbetont*) and in that state only will it have a tendency to change its meaning. An example of almost universal application is the recent word *bol-schewik*. The association of this word with certain emotions causes it to bob up into consciousness much more frequently than a word in which the emotional factor is less strong, with the result that this gives rise to its use in situations quite different from those which called forth its first use. So the term may be applied to any number of individuals one does not like and its meaning limited only by the number of persons to which it is applied. This is only one of numerous examples Sperber gives to illustrate this psychic phenomenon. Undoubtedly he has here hit upon an important semantic fact, but when he insists upon emotion as the only decisive factor in all changes in meaning, he goes too far.³ Wellander, in the work discussed here, has shown that a new meaning may arise in the case of ellipsis or word-reduction. As soon as the *Regen* of *Regenschirm* or the *Schreib* of *Schreibfeder* is omitted, the simple form *Schirm* or *Feder* immediately takes on a new meaning. Where is there any emotional factor in the omission of the first element of the compound?

Another fact upon which Sperber lays considerable stress is what he designates as *Konsoziation*, a term he borrows from Norreen's *Vårt Språk*, and which we may render by *co-association*, altho we admit the pleonasm in the compound. The co-associations are the accompanying ideas or feelings, whether conscious or unconscious, associated with the use of a word. These associations are just as important for the development of meaning of the word as the principal meaning itself and must be taken into account in any thoro investigation of its semantic history. Sperber's examples of these associations are all taken from Middle High German writers. Thus Wolfram von Eschenbach co-associates *herze* and *ougen* in a large number of passages. If the

³ In a recent article in the *Zs. d. A.*, vol. 59, p. 53, note, he goes so far as to challenge any one to name a single instance where the emotional factor plays no part in semantic change.

connecting link were then, as is likely, a word like *Träne*, the association would clearly indicate that for Wolfram *herze* had a connotation of sadness.

It is the opinion of some linguistic scholars that while there undoubtedly are laws governing semantic phenomena, it is questionable whether they will ever be discovered. Some doubt such laws altogether.⁴ Wellander, in the above work (pp. iv, v), believes there are laws, but since we are only at the beginning of semantic investigation, at the stage where we are still trying to determine types of semantic change, there are many steps to be taken before we can hope to come upon traces of semantic laws. Sperber, however, does not hesitate to formulate such a law. Developing further his idea of co-association, he observes that concepts strongly emotionalized show a tendency to persist in consciousness. So a person for whom, for example, the word *music* was emotionally emphasized (*affektbetont*), would be likely to use for an idea 'agreement' a word like *harmony* or *accord*, etc. This psychological tendency Sperber formulates into the following law: "If at a certain time a complex of ideas (*Vorstellungskomplex*) becomes so strongly emotionalized that it forces one word beyond the limits of its original meaning and causes it to take on a new meaning, then one may definitely expect that the same complex of ideas will force other expressions belonging to it to overstep the limits of their semantic use and will lead to the development of new meanings." The author has apparently so far applied his law only to show the influence of the special vocabularies in which the emotionalized words originate, on the general vocabulary. Thus, if we take the military language, we find that at certain periods such words as *bestürmen*, *Ausfall*, *untergraben*, etc., becoming emotionalized, developed meanings which, as a result of the functioning of the law, became part of the general vocabulary.

Unfortunately Sperber vitiates the good impression of the really constructive parts of his work by his polemical tendencies against those who differ from him, especially against Wellander. He opposes not only a number of the latter's classifications, but rather

⁴ Compare, for example, Nyrop, *Grammaire historique de la langue française* iv, § 112, and Saussure, *Cours de linguistique générale*, p. 135.

superfluously takes up the cudgels in behalf of Meringer and his socio-historical linguistic investigations (*Sachforschung*), apparently mainly because Wellander had regarded them as rather exaggerated as far as their semantic value was concerned. What purpose have controversies of this sort in an *Introduction to Semantic Study*?

SAMUEL KROESCH.

University of Minnesota.

Ver y No Creer; a Comedia Attributed to Lope de Vega. By GEORGE I. DALE. Reprinted from *Washington University Studies*. Vol. XI, Humanistic Series, No. 1. 1923.

This edition is the result of the collation of an anonymous MS. in the Biblioteca Nacional at Madrid with the printed version of a play of the same name published in the spurious *Parte veinticuatro de las Comedias del Fenix de España Lope-de Vega Carpio, y las mejores que hasta aora han salido*, published in 1632 by Jusepe Ginobart, "mercader de libros." Although all of the plays in this volume are attributed to Lope, only four are known to be his, two belong certainly to Ruíz de Alarcón, and one to Matías de los Reyes. This spurious publication under Lope's name seems to have been the principal ground for attributing the authorship of this play to him, succeeding commentators seeming to have been contented to take the word of Jusepe Ginobart at its face value—including La Barrera, Paz y Melia, and Durán.

The MS. which serves as the basis of the present edition is Catalogue Number 2364 in the Biblioteca Nacional; it is anonymous, and bears "aprobaciones" of August 5 and October 16, 1619. Only the last folio, bearing the "aprobaciones" and the last fourteen verses of the play (which are not in Lope's hand), belong to the MS. as originally approved; the remainder of the play is written in several hands of the eighteenth century. The identity of the author is nowhere implied, either in the "aprobaciones" or in the body of the play.

The play itself is of such little value, either bibliographical or literary, that it is doubtful that its publication can be brought to serve any useful purpose. If it is Lope's—which, by the editor's

frank admission, is at best open to doubt—it can scarcely be hoped that it will throw any new light upon his work. But the MS. is not of the seventeenth century, its authorship is a matter of supposition and conjecture, and the only patently genuine thing about it is the official approval of the authorities.

The publication of the play under Lope's name in the spurious *Parte veinticuatro* of 1632 argues nothing; Lope's reputation as a popular dramatist was utilized commercially over and over again by booksellers and "autores de comedias" alike, and nothing was more common in the Golden Age than the publication of poly-genetic collections of plays of unknown or obscure authorship, the only bid of which for public favor consisted in their claim to have proceeded from the hand of the Fénix.¹

The following interior evidence is adduced by the editor in support of Lope's authorship:

The play is in Lope's style. This is important, if so; but it should be borne in mind that while Lope was capable of producing wildly extravagant plots, his most riotous extravaganzas never succeeded in being dull. And *Ver y no creer* is dull to a superlative degree; the action is unmotivated, the entrances and exits wooden and mechanical, the complication unreasonable and ridiculous—the dénouement particularly being brought about in a fashion that outrages reason.² It is argued that, assuming the play to be Lope's, it must belong to an early period; but, without the necessity for commentation upon the proper precedence of cart and horse, it is

¹ "Mais pour quiconque veut bien réfléchir à la facilité avec laquelle, au dix-septième siècle, une pièce était attribuée à tel ou tel auteur par un imprimeur ou par un libraire, il ne saurait être douteux que la présence du nom de Lope en tête d'une comedia non publiée par lui ne constitue à elle seule ni une preuve, ni un commencement de preuve, ni même une présomption. Elle signifie simplement que l'éditeur la lui attribuait, de bonne foi ou dans le seul espoir de la mieux vendre. Il suffit de se rappeler le grand nombre d'attributions erronées qui n'ont pas d'autre origine pour être édifié sur la compétence de ces 'attributeurs.'" R. Foulché Delbosc, "La Estrella de Sevilla," *Revue Hispanique*, XLVIII, 530 f.

² Lope's *La desdichada Estefanía*, the complication of which, though with a tragic desenredo, is a parallel of that of *Ver y no creer*, furnishes an interesting and instructive contrast in the masterly manner in which the same theme is handled. *La desdichada Estefanía* was published in 1619, the date of the MS. of *Ver y no creer*. Cf. the Real Academia's edition of Lope's *Obras*, VIII.

to be noted that comparison of *Ver y no creer* with plays of Lope's earliest period results in no advantage.³ At the time when Lope was supposedly engaged in the confection of this dull monstrosity, he was writing plays of such dramatic and literary worth as *La pobreza estimada*, *Los comendadores de Córdoba*, *El testimonio vengado*, and *Adonis y Venus*, all of which, on Lope's own authority, antedate 1603, and are fairly representative of his earlier period.

Employment of *commedia dell' arte* tricks. Lope drew many of his devices from the Italians, but the influence of the *commedia dell' arte* is to be seen in the Spanish drama from the beginning to the close of the Golden Age. The plays of Lope de Rueda, Juan de Timoneda, Cristóbal de Virues, and, later, those of Lope's contemporaries and successors, show as much patterning after the Italian school as do those of Lope himself.

Use of mythological and classical references. This was a general literary convention of the period, and was not at all individually characteristic of Lope. It is to be noted, not to make the list too prolix, in the works of all of the authors above cited, and was not at all confined to the drama or to Spain, but extended throughout the literature of the Renaissance.

Italianate names of lovers. Lope often used affected Italianate names for his principals in plays of the "romance" type; but he was less addicted to this use than was Calderón. Tirso de Molina, Andrés de Claramonte, Guillén de Castro, Ricardo de Turia, Gaspar de Aguilar, and the Canón Tárrega also show a fondness for Italianate names. There are only two Italianate names in *Ver y no creer*—Fabio and Leonora.

The figure of the hero's servant, so important a one in Lope's plays, cannot be adduced as a proof of authorship; this personage, by name Clascano, a soldier who attaches himself to the hero's fortunes toward the middle of the first act, is weak, supine, and stupid; he does nothing to advance the intrigue, and only once does he make a flaccid attempt to be humorous. Lope developed the part of the hero's servant as an important agent in the promotion of the intrigue; as early as 1603 he was witty, resourceful, commentative, the satirical critic and the ingenious promoter of

³ For purposes of comparison, the plays listed in the prologue of the first edition of *El peregrino en su patria* (1604) furnish a fair basis.

his master's love affairs.⁴ There are many early plays of Lope in which there is no comic servant; but I know of none in which the figure is introduced without being given an important part in the development of the intrigue. Nor do I know of any one of Lope's plays in which the figure, if it occurs, is not introduced early in the course of the action.

In the edition under discussion, one would have preferred that more attention should have been paid to the many and obvious lacunae, while the notes on versification might well have been more extended in their scope, particularly as regards the correspondence of the use of verse forms in *Ver y no creer* with Lope's practise during the period in which the play was written.

It is difficult to see that any useful purpose is to be served by the attribution of this work to Lope or to any other, considering the tenuous quality of the evidence upon which any conclusion must rest, and the utter lack of intrinsic value in the play itself. However, the printed version of 1632 and the eighteenth-century MS. reproduced by Professor Dale may be conceded to have some value as examples of the dramatic hack-work of the Golden Age.

W. A. WHATLEY.

The Ohio State University.

Der Traum in der deutschen Romantik. Von PHILIPP LERSCH.
München: Hochschulbuchhandlung Max Hueber, 1923. 70 pp.

It might well be asked whether the study of German Romanticism has not in the past been directed too much to large, comprehensive aspects, that is, to the movement as a whole, and whether more particular points and details, the minutiae or *Bausteine*, have not been somewhat neglected. Indeed, there is reason to believe that if the long list of general treatises beginning with Haym had been preceded by a still longer list of special monographs, our ideas about Romanticism would today be clearer and more fixed.

⁴ Cf. the Tancredo of *La pobreza estimada*, the Galindo of *Los comendadores de Córdoba*, and the Hortensio and Belardo of *La fuerza lastimosa*, all of which plays belong to the period before 1603.

From this point of view the work of Lersch, although belated, is quite valuable.

Starting with the purely rationalistic conception of the dream during the age of Enlightenment, the author traces, through Herder and Jean Paul, a gradually changing attitude, culminating in the Romantic point of view, which regards the dream as the archetype or *Urbild* of all true poetry. This idea is described as arising in direct opposition to that of the Rationalists. With these premises, the Romantic interpretation of the dream is considered from two aspects, viz., the dream as life, that is, its reality for the inner, spiritual man; and life as a dream, that is, the unreality and incomprehensibility of life for the external, conscious man (compare Schopenhauer).

The author's purpose to restrict his investigation to G. H. von Schubert and the Older Romanticists (p. 7) has not been consistently carried out. He has included some discussion of E. T. A. Hoffmann and Eichendorff and dwelt at greater length upon Kleist. This is not to be deprecated, for neglect of Kleist, especially, would have made the study very fragmentary and inconclusive. In the relation of Strahl to Kätchen, Lersch discovers suggestions of the relation, imperfectly developed, between the somnambulist and the magnetiser (p. 36). In *Homburg* he recognizes the intention on the part of Kleist to have the hero conceived as a somnambulist. Although it will be difficult for many to subscribe entirely to the author's reasoning on these pages (pp. 35-38), his summary seems correct (p. 38): "Aber jedenfalls ist zu erkennen, dass des Dichters Interesse auch hier (i. e., in *Homburg*) wie im Kätchen letzten Endes der dichterisch-symbolischen Kraft galt, die in der Darstellung von Traumzuständen für ihn gelegen war."

The effective point of departure which Lersch uses for his exposition is (p. 9) that Romanticism seeks to comprehend the world not as a concrete object (*Gegenstand*) but as a condition (*Zustand*). In conceiving his problem in this manner, he furnishes us with a new point of view from which to consider the great antithesis embodied in Classicism and Romanticism. We have become accustomed to finding this antithesis described by such contrasts as 1) the state of being (*Sein*) and 2) the state of becoming (*Werden*); 1) the finite or the consummate and 2)

the infinite; 1) fulfilment and 2) yearning; 1) the Apollinian and 2) the Dionysiac; or 1) the masculine and 2) the feminine. Lersch adds to these the conception just mentioned. Furthermore he establishes a parallelism between Classicism and the state of being awake, on the one hand, and Romanticism and the state of dreaming, on the other.

The main emphasis of the work falls upon Tieck and Novalis. With both the dream is, of course, immensely popular. But for Novalis it transcends its dream-nature and becomes life—a means of peering through the veil of earthly existence into the Great Beyond; Tieck, on the other hand, always remains conscious that it is a dream. In somewhat analogous manner the imaginative power of the two poets in general is contrasted (p. 51). Unfortunately there is no discussion at all of one of the most remarkable of Tieck's *Kunstmärchen*, namely, *Die Seele*, a striking tale in which the soul of the sleeping hero temporarily leaves its body in the form of a mouse, only to return after it has made a wonderful discovery, which is meanwhile communicated to the sleeper in a dream. In the opinion of the reviewer this story throws more light upon Tieck's treatment of the dream and his attitude toward it than any passage noticed by the author.

The last section of the work, from page 56 on, dealing with dream reminiscences in the Romantic *Märchen* and drawing an excellent analogy with Tieck's satirical dramas (pp. 62 ff.) is perhaps the most valuable portion of all.

It is to be regretted that a study of some intrinsic value such as this should be marred by frequent lack of specific references and by poor proof-reading. The first-mentioned objection is illustrated by the casual paraphrase (p. 16), without definite reference, of the following words of Siegfried in Tieck's *Genoveva*, which represent as clear an anticipation of a phase of the Freudian suppressed desires as one could wish for in literature:

Wie man im Traume oft die eignen Wünsche
Zum innigsten Entsetzen kennen lernt.

(Tieck, Cotta ed., II, 134).

As for proof-reading, punctuation especially has suffered. Over three dozen necessary commas are omitted. Besides there are at least fifteen other obvious typographical errors.

Indiana University.

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL.

Ferdinand Brunetière et la Critique Littéraire, par WALTER JÉQUIER, Thèse, Lausanne, 1922.

M. Jéquier has an intuition of "the infinite otherwiseness of things," and so when he comes in contact with Brunetière's conviction of unity he reacts,—with something of the militant intransigence which characterizes the subject of his attack.

Not that there is any philosophy in the intention. The author will not study, he tells us in the Introduction, the intellectual or ethical or religious evolution of Brunetière (for these we are referred to Victor Giraud); he will not even consider ideas on literary criticism except from the point of view which Brunetière always took, *le point de vue logique*. Did Brunetière succeed in proving anything? This is the single issue that M. Jéquier deliberately raises. But it is obvious, as one peruses the book, that the writer continually deals with generalizations which force him to break bounds.

As to many details (which, if our definition is right, are what primarily interest M. Jéquier), in a style that a superabundance of dashes, varied by rows of dots, renders a little choppy (perhaps this too is a problem in unity), he makes good points. He reveals a significant inconsistency in Brunetière's judgments of Rousseau and an important contradiction in Brunetière's assessment of Balzac and Flaubert; he objects validly to the speed with which Brunetière read his documents; he ably attacks Brunetière's objections to impartiality in criticism (in spite of himself M. Jéquier approaches general ideas); he wisely allies himself with Goethe and Sainte-Beuve on the matter of sympathy in criticism. There is a suggestion here and there less of sympathy than of petulance, born no doubt of his irritation at Brunetière's philosophy.

For do what he will M. Jéquier cannot avoid the main issue. It becomes very clear that he himself, on the subject of literary values, is completely a relativist, so completely that with a downrightness not unlike Brunetière's he asks who today could be anything else, and with a power of exclusion not unlike his author's he is unaware of such critics as Maurras, Lasserre, Belloc, More and Babbitt. And the result of this fundamental if not explicit objection to Brunetière's doctrine is a hostile appraisal of the author of the *Discours de Combat*. Had M. Jéquier admitted the

issue and had he granted that there are two sides he might have dealt with the subject in a broader manner.

Consider for example an essay of Brunetière's which lends itself to such scientific discussion as is normal in a thesis, that on *le Caractère Essentiel de la Littérature Française*. It contains characteristic inconsistencies; in the manner to which M. Jéquier, with his respect for the integrity of material, properly objects, Brunetière (be it said without impugning his sincerity) is manipulating the evidence. But, discounting this, Brunetière arrives at a generalization which compells attention and has a degree of validity, and his style here as elsewhere has a bracing quality which, altho M. Jéquier is not prompt to recognize it, may be counted a real contribution to French criticism. And the conclusion to which Brunetière comes, as a little interpretation and the admission of the existence of main issues will show, is a revelation of his essential, and important, doctrine. The bond of the social (*le caractère essentiel*) is the bond of common humanity, the idea of common humanity is close to the idea of a permanent human element, and this brings us to the Brunetière absolute, "an absolute based on the unity of the human spirit as it has manifested itself in history."⁴

The humanism of Brunetière, whatever be one's personal judgment of it, is a significant historical phenomenon, in a century the chief tendency of which had been in the opposite direction, of which it had been the principal activity to put man into nature. An investigation of it and a placing of Brunetière historically would be an important part of a complete study of Brunetière's literary criticism, and should commend itself to M. Jéquier, who has historical perspective, who knows about the critics of the eighteenth century, beginning with Du Bos, and is well acquainted with the modern period.² Furthermore a recog-

¹ Babbitt, *Masters of French Criticism*, Boston, 1913, p. 328. Frequent references in Brunetière's article to "l'intérêt proprement humain" and to "cet homme universel" show the persistence of this conception in the critic's mind.

² Altho the reviewer thinks, contrary to M. Jéquier, that Brunetière is right in insisting upon the pioneer character of the criticism of Sainte-Beuve. M. Jéquier makes the usual mistake about the meaning of Buffon's *le style, c'est l'homme* (p. 149); he takes Buffon to be relativistic, where-

nition of the existence of this humanism throws an entirely different light upon certain claims of Brunetière to objectivity, upon his attempt to approach a universal. As M. Jéquier points out, Brunetière cannot deny a subjective quality in criticism. But if one accepts the notion of similar sensibilities in a series of subjects—of a common reaction of their common humanity—the words subjective and objective are less pertinent, and to insist upon them is to insist upon conceptions which for the opponent in the debate are not valid. The debaters are arguing in different dimensions.

Another consideration not stressed by M. Jéquier is the psychology of Brunetière, yet a writer whose favorite remark is: "Je ne suis pas du tout de cet avis" has a twist in his mentality not to be neglected by a student of his criticism. There remain also a host of problems personal but not necessarily becoming mere gossip; if some of Brunetière's criticism was colored by his personal hates, as the author of the thesis says ("affective and not logical") the details of these should be scrutinized in a historical, scientific spirit—no less could be demanded of so good a relativist as M. Jéquier. Perhaps in a later work he will extend himself in these directions.³

HORATIO E. SMITH.

Amherst College.

Thomas Hardy's Universe. A Study of a Poet's Mind. By ERNEST BRENNECKE, JR. London: Fisher Unwin.

It is an agreeable habit of those who seek to interpret Mr. Hardy's work to confine their discussion to a single phase of his genius. From the earliest criticism of the novels by Lionel Johnson, now the classic among Hardy studies, to the latest discussion by Mr. Brennecke there has been more detailed research than is

as Buffon's point of view is altogether different. Cf. the *examen critique* in Hatzfeld's edition of the *Discours sur le Style*, Paris, Lecoffre, 1872, especially p. xii.

* In a definitive work he should include a bibliography and an index. Misprints in the volume are few; we have noted: p. 3, *dour*, read *pour*; p. 27, *lde*, read *de*; p. 60, *artitique*, read *artistique*; p. 90, *constestons*, read *contestons*.

common in the studies of a living writer. Mr. Hardy's novels, presenting with epic scope and unity of design a modern *tragédie humaine*, have very widely appealed to critics; his poetry less widely. But it is quite remarkable that the one field in which Mr. Hardy has generally been granted supremacy, at least since Browning, that of philosophical poetry, has to the present received only rather uncritical attention.

Mr. Brennecke has set out to accomplish for the philosopher what his predecessors did for the technician, novelist, and poet. As a critic of Mr. Hardy's thought, Mr. Brennecke's way is obviously beset with pitfalls, of all the most treacherous, perhaps, the tendency to attach ready-made labels to whatever he finds. But Mr. Brennecke treads warily; he recognizes that a poet and a professional philosopher can never be the same; and his definition of philosophy in this study of Mr. Hardy, as "the prevailing colour and composition of the screen through which he views the world in his writings," surely promises much. To get the perspective for his study, Mr. Brennecke chooses Schopenhauerian lenses. The choice is, of course, not arbitrary, for many critics before Mr. Brennecke have noticed that Schopenhauer and Mr. Hardy have stood agreed at certain points. Much of the book is devoted to tracing, especially in *The Dynasts*, the five attributes of the Will, as set down by Schopenhauer. The most telling examples are found in connection with Mr. Hardy's urging the aimlessness and unconsciousness of the Will:

Why prompts the Will so senseless-shaped a doing?
I have told thee that it works unwittingly,
As one possessed, not judging.

Why doth It so and so, and ever so,
This viewless, voiceless Turner of the Wheel?

Although the reader may find too much Schopenhauer in the early chapters, he will find by no means dull reading, for Mr. Brennecke is an accomplished and a zealous student of his subject. More directly to the purpose is the finely conceived chapter, "A Metaphysical Biography of Thomas Hardy," in which the critic shows the essential unity of Mr. Hardy's thought. Even the casual reader of the Wessex novels must be struck with the frequent use of such expressions as, "it chanced," "it so happened"; and Mr. Bren-

necke's discussion of those "purblind doomsters," time and chance, shows how Mr. Hardy's philosophical habit inclines him to combine the slightly considered things of life again and again into a plausible basis for tragedy. The dainty Elfride, whose charms Mr. Hardy is at pains to discredit, represents the capriciousness of chance in confounding two capable men. Like the Greek sceptics, Mr. Hardy contends that man's greatest trials result from the inconsequence rather than from the consequence of things. This is particularly noticeable in his treatment of the physical and moral wearing down of character, for unlike Zola and his school, Mr. Hardy is never anxious to stress an inherent weakness which might serve to bring about ultimate destruction, but lets his character go down in an unequal warfare with circumstances. Mr. Brennecke's method is not to present his evidence in incontrovertible mass; in fact, had he wished it he might have filled a lengthy chapter with examples of disaster and unhappiness which attend the delivery or non-delivery of letters, though in touching many representative phases of Mr. Hardy's thought his brevity is occasionally not very convincing, as in his discussion of Mr. Hardy's conception of love and woman.

Having so far considered Schopenhauer and his ways in Mr. Hardy's work, Mr. Brennecke is doubtless rather put to it when he comes to the question of pessimist or optimist. Mr. Hardy has several times let it be known that he does not relish being called a pessimist; Mr. Brennecke after slight hesitation fortifies himself with what comfort he can against the idea that Mr. Hardy is one, wholeheartedly. But with an eye to his definition of philosophy, Mr. Brennecke is content to let Mr. Hardy speak for himself, in the conversation reported by Mr. Archer: "My pessimism, if pessimism it be, does not involve the assumption that the world is going to the dogs, and that Ahriman is winning all along the line. On the contrary, my practical philosophy is distinctly meliorist. What are my books but one plea against 'man's inhumanity to man,' to woman—and to the lower animals . . . ? When we have got rid of a thousand remediable ills, it will be time enough to determine whether the ill that is irremediable outweighs the good." Mr. Brennecke further supports the meliorist view by calling attention to the passage in *The Dynasts*, where the Will, at length grown conscious, "fashions all things fair"; and he very justly concludes,

"Hardy's basic optimism, paradoxical as that expression must sound to his superficial readers and critics, may best be observed in his underlying humanity, in the ground-tone of pity that sounds through all his work."

Mr. Brennecke's merit as a critic is that he keeps on the windy side of crystallized opinion and theory, and has permitted Mr. Hardy the rich individuality he deserves.

A. L. CARTER.

Pennsylvania State College.

CORRESPONDENCE

IMOGEN AND NERONIS

Some years ago,¹ I pointed out what still seems to me to be a close parallel in *Cymbeline*, III, 5, IV, 2,² to *The First Part of Jeronimo*, II, 2, 4.³ A portion of the resemblance of these passages lies in the mistaking of the corpse of an unfavored suitor who has disguised himself in the clothing of his successful rival, for that of the fortunate man. The errors in identification in *Cymbeline* and *Jeronimo* are made by the ladies whose love is sought.

A play earlier certainly—perhaps much earlier—than either *Cymbeline* or *Jeronimo* contains an incident which in its outlines presents a possible source for the passages noted above in one drama or the other, or, it may be, in both. This is *Sir Clyomon and Sir Clamydes*, which was once assigned to Peele. In this comedy, or, more properly, tragicomedy, scs. 11, 12, 15, 16, 18,⁴ are those which may have influenced Shakespeare. The Princess Neronis loves, and is loved by, Prince Clyomon. They exchange vows, and Clyomon leaves the court of Neronis' father, the King of the Isle of Marshes. Thrasellus King of Norway, who is in love with Neronis, having been refused her hand, abducts her; but in man's attire she escapes from him, and takes refuge with Corin, an old shepherd. Learning of the deed of Thrasellus, Clyomon sets out to rescue Neronis. He meets Thrasellus whom he slays. Aided by Corin, Clyomon inters the body of Thrasellus, hanging his own golden shield and his sword over the grave with an inscription on

¹ In "Some Parallels to Passages in *The First Part of Jeronimo*," *M. L. N.*, April, 1912.

² Shakespeare's *Complete Works*. Ed. by W. A. Neilson. "Cambridge" Edition.

³ Kyd's *Works*. Ed. by F. S. Boas, Oxford, 1901.

⁴ Peele's *Works*. Ed. by A. H. Bullen, Boston, 1887.

the former in which are related the circumstances of the combat. After Clyomon and Corin have left the spot, Neronis, still in disguise, enters, sees the shield of Clyomon, but overlooks the inscription, and therefore believes her lover slain, and buried in the grave. She is about to commit suicide with Clyomon's sword—after singing a song,—when Providence descends and stops her, assuring her that she shall before long see Clyomon, who is not dead.

The points of likeness between *Sir Clyomon* and *Cymbeline* are evident. Two princesses leave their fathers' palaces because of the attentions of unwelcome lovers—one involuntarily, the other voluntarily. Both ultimately take refuge with country folk—one with a shepherd, the other with an apparent forester and his supposed sons. Each princess is followed by the unfavored suitor. In *Sir Clyomon* he is slain by the favored lover; in *Cymbeline* by the brother of Imogen, who is seemingly a woodsman. Then an error in the identification of the dead man occurs in both plays: Neronis believes the grave which she finds to be that of the knight whose arms hang above it; Imogen considers the headless trunk in the clothing of Posthumus, which she discovers, to be indeed that of her betrothed. Imogen, who has been near death previously at the hands of her stepmother and of Pisanio, swoons on the body, to be roused by the entrance of the Roman army; Neronis is dissuaded from suicide only by the personal intervention of Providence.

The scenes of *Sir Clyomon* and *Sir Clamydes* which present the adventures of Neronis in the forest are much closer to the scenes dealing with the error of Imogen in *Cymbeline* than they are to that in *Jeronimo* in which Bel-Imperia mistakes the body of Alarico for the corpse of Andrea, her lover. In the Shakespearian and pseudo-Kydian plays, the likeness lies in the use of the same dramatic device. There is no very great question of source between the two.

The situation is perhaps different with *Sir Clyomon* and *Cymbeline*. There is a correspondence in the two plays between the events leading up to the mistakes of the heroines, which may be significant. Further, and this is important possibly, there is no trace of Imogen's error of identification in any tale which has been previously proposed as a source of *Cymbeline*.

Consequently, I feel justified in suggesting that, though the parallelism between *Jeronimo* and *Cymbeline* exists, as shown in my earlier article, yet for the true source of the incident in question in the Shakespearian play we may go back to the early romantic drama of *Sir Clyomon* and *Sir Clamydes*.

R. S. FORSYTHE.

Northwestern University.

EARLY FRENCH REMARKS ON AMERICAN LITERATURE *en masse*

It is the opinion of M. Fernand Baldensperger that the French Romantics clearly distinguished between English and American literature. Undoubtedly; but familiarity with and imitation of both literatures made, on the average, for Romanticism. While English writers came to be very widely discussed about 1820, American writers received notable attention only some seven or eight years later, and American literature in mass was hardly recognized before 1830.

In 1831 it was stated that "les lecteurs français ne connaissent guère la littérature américaine que par les essais fleuris, polis, essentiellement raisonnables, de . . . Washington Irving, . . . et par la poésie extérieure et mobile de Cooper. . . . Ce sont pour nous les deux génies transcendants des Etats-Unis, les représentants du classicisme et du romantisme dans le Nouveau-Monde."¹ The following year, Fontaney, charming poet as well as a competent critic of literature written in English, contributed to the *Revue des Deux Mondes* a noteworthy article² on Cooper³; also in June, F. de Champagny had, in the *Revue européenne*, a study on Irving's work, wherein he remarked that "deux noms seulement ont passé l'Atlantique"—those of Cooper and Irving; in March, R. (possibly Charles de Rémusat), in reviewing⁴ one of Cooper's novels, had said that the author was easily the best of the novelists from the States, but he also named Irving and Paulding⁵ and called all three "romanciers anglo-américains." In 1833, Théodore Muret (critic, dramatist and novelist) accounted⁶ for Cooper's rapid rise to fame in these words: "Le romancier américain eut le bonheur de venir à propos. . . . Quand on annonça pour la première fois un auteur américain, ce fut une espèce de phénomène, autour duquel la foule s'empressa. . . ." In 1835, B. sent two appreciative articles to the unfortunately short-lived *Revue poétique*, and Philarète Charles, who was the greatest French authority on English and American literature from 1830 till his death, furnished the *Revue des Deux Mondes*⁷ with a study entitled "La littérature aux Etats-Unis." Charles maintained that the Americans possessed no literature specially their own (Cooper imitating Scott, Irving following in the footsteps of Addison and Goldsmith); three poets, Bryant, Percival and Dana, deserved mention; three writers, Cooper, Irving and Channing, had become known, the two former cele-

¹ *Revue Encyclopédique*, March, 1831, A. M.'s notice on Brockden Brown's novels.

² In the June number, under "Littérature américaine."

³ Who had been reviewed as early as 1823.

⁴ In the *Journal des Débats*, 16th March, 1832.

⁵ R. forgot Brown, whose *Wieland* had been translated in 1804.

⁶ In *La Quotidienne*, 4th Oct., 1833.

⁷ Fourth Series, t. III, pp. 169 ff.

brated, in France. And in 1840 Augustin Thierry,⁸ in a letter to George Ticknor, wrote that he would gladly talk with him "de l'avenir littéraire des Etats-Unis qui semblent vouloir prendre sur ce point, 'comme en tout le reste, leur revanche sur la vieille Angleterre."

After that date, the French critics often spoke of American literature as national and independent.

Oxford.

ERIC PARTRIDGE.

NOTES ON ROBERT GREENE'S PLAYS

The following notes are made with reference to J. Churton Collins' edition of *The Plays and Poems of Robert Greene* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1905). They assume also an acquaintance with Dr. W. W. Greg's discussion of the *Orlando Furioso* (in the Malone Society Reprints, extra volume, 1922).

Alphonsus

287. "The sillie serpent . . . cut in pieces . . . if her head do scape away vntoucht, As many write, it very stranglye goes To fetch an herbe," etc. For this bit of natural history, cp. Roger Bacon, *Opus Majus* (ed. J. H. Bridges, II, 208): "Nam Parisius (*Parisius*?) nuper fuit unus sapiens, qui serpentes quaesivit et unum accepit et scidit eum in parva frusta, nisi quod pellis ventris, super quam reperet, remansit integra, et iste serpens repebat ut poterat ad herbam quandam, cujus tactu statim sanabatur."

Orlando Furioso

516. "He slily haue engraun." Misprint for "He slily," etc.

671. "Foemineum seruile genus, crudele, superbum." From 'good old Mantuan,' *Ecl.* iv, 110.

790. "Tell me, sweet Goddess, will Ioue send Mercury to Calipso, to let me goe?" Allusion to Homer, *Od.* v. 13 ff.

948. "My helme forgd by the Cyclops for Anchises Sonne." The text is doubtful; the Alleyn ms. has "My shield," etc. Venus brought Aeneas a helmet as well as a shield, *Aen.* viii. 620.

1070. "Marsilius, mee Commende." Misprint for "wee commende."

1086. "He passe the Alpes, and vp to Meroe." It is possibly worth noting that Juvenal mentions the Alps and Meroe together, *Sat.* xiii. 162, "Quis tumidum guttur miratur in Alpibus aut quis In Meroe crasso maiorem infante mamillam?"

Frier Bacon and Frier Bongay

192. "That which is aboue vs pertains nothing to vs." Lac-

⁸ See A. Augustin-Thierry, *Augustin Thierry d'après sa correspondance*, 1922.

tantius, *Divin. Inst.* III. 20, 10, "celebre hoc proverbium Socrates habuit: quod supra nos, nihil ad nos."

1482. "The flies *Haemerae*." Apparently the famous insects on the banks of the Hypanis, called *hemerobia* or *ephemera* (Plin. *N. H.* XI, 43, 120; Arist. *Hist. An.* x. 19).

1542. "Three-formed Luna." Horace's 'diva triformis,' *Od.* III, 22, 4; Ovid's 'triformis dea,' *Met.* VII. 94; Seneca's Hecate triformis,' *Phaedra*, 412.

James the Fourth

945. "The pilot in the dangerous seas is knowne: In calmer waues the sillie sailor struiues." Cp. Seneca, *Ep.* 84, 34, "Gubernatoris artem adeo non impedit, ut ostendat; tranquillo enim, ut aiunt, quilibet gubernator est."

1738. "The Thracian Stone: for who toucheth it is exempted from griefe." The stone 'Pausilypus' found in the Strymon. Dr. M. W. Croll, in his edition of Lyly's *Euphues*, p. 299, cites it from the pseudo-Plutarchean treatise *De Fluv. et Mont. Nomîn.* XI.

1743. "Melle dulcior fluit oratio." Cp. Cic. *Sen.* x. 31, "Etenim, ut ait Homerus, ex eius lingua melle dulcior fluebat oratio."

W. P. MUSTARD.

The Johns Hopkins University.

OLD FRENCH *Wandichet*, *Guandichet*

In my two editions of the *Espurgatoire saint Patriz* of Marie de France (1894 and 1903) I was unable to identify this word, evidently an architectural term; now, thanks to a note of J. Vising,¹ who is commenting upon *Donnei des Amanz*, v. 905, the obscurity disappears. The lines in Marie should read:

Faite a pilers e a archez,
A volsurs e a wandichez (vv. 689-90)

which I take to mean, 'constructed with pillars and small arches, with recessed steppings and with small, rod-like columns' (whether clustered or not). Marie is describing the elaborate architecture of the "palace" (*aula* in the Latin) which the Knight Owein met with at the outset of his subterranean pilgrimage, and the details given fit well with the idea of Ezio Levi that Marie had first-hand acquaintance with the life of the cloister.

The word (*wandiches* in the unique MS.) is a compound of Germanic *wand* 'rod,' with double suffix, like *tourniquet*, *goni-*

¹ *Zeits. für franz. Sprache und Litt.*, XXXIX (1912), p. 5.

chon. The line in the *Donnei des Amanz*, emended by Vising: *A wandie falt guandichet*, I take to mean 'A rod (chastisement) is the best way to meet evasion (deception).' OF *gande*, *gandie* are well known in this sense, as is the verb *g(u)andir*, from which they derive. No doubt something of a pun was intended.

I take this opportunity to print some corrections to the text of the *Espurgatoire*, a few of which appeared upon an Errata slip which failed to be inserted in some copies:

Line 66 *D'altres et par*. 297 *Itels* and delete the variant. 319 *Tuz*. 360 a period. 535 *Pur c'eslirai, par Deu licence*. 591 *Li priur*. 656 *Dunt de diables*. 720 *sa bunté*. 849 *tuz*. 864 *noz*. 947 *de fer*. 1070 *le meinent*. 1077 *E si i aveit*. 1118 *E par cel nun*. 1149 *trestuz*. 1406 *cez*. 1456 *Se nus ne lur*. 1515 *Tute*. 1756 *cumbien*. 1763 *aliege*. 1819 *Descent del ciel, ço li fu vis*. 1838 *Qu'il a eue*. 1849 *revendrez*. 1850 *vus veez*. 1904 *li priur*. 2006 *e nun*. On p. 8, as pointed out by L. Foulet, the sentence should read: a Second Hermit, with whom the First Hermit was anxious to become acquainted. The First Hermit then tells him (the chaplain) of an assembly of devils, etc. In the Latin text: p. 16 *intenderet*. 62 *auxiliante*. 95 *audiui*.

University of Chicago.

T. ATKINSON JENKINS.

THE SOURCE OF A FOURTEENTH CENTURY LYRIC

In the introduction to his recent volume *Religious Lyrics of the Fourteenth Century*, Professor Carleton Brown makes the following comment on the lyric entitled by him "Jesus Pleads with the Worlding:" "No. 126 is interesting as a distinctly fresh treatment of the old theme of Christ's appeal to man; the contrast between the fashionable worlding and the pains of the Passion is effectively drawn."¹ Interesting the poem assuredly is,—not, however, as a 'distinctly fresh treatment of an old theme,' but as a sympathetic translation of a passage attributed to St. Bernard which is found in the *Legenda Aurea*. The passage follows:

Bernardus: tu homo es et habes sertum de floribus et ego Deus et habeo coronam de spinis, tu habes chirothecas in manibus et ego habeo clavos defixos, tu in albis vestibus tripudias et ego pro te derisus fui ab Herode in veste alba, tu tripudias cum pedibus et ego laboravi cum meis pedibus, tu in choreis brachia extendis in modum crucis in gaudium et ego ea in cruce extensa habui in opprobrium, ego in cruce dolui et tu in cruce exultas, tu habes latus apertum et pectus in signum vanae gloriae et ego latus effossum habui pro te. Tamen revertere ad me et ego suscipiam te.²

The English poet has rendered his original faithfully in essen-

¹ Oxford University Press, 1924, p. xxi.

² Ed. Graesse (1850), p. 227. I have been unable to find the passage in the works of Bernard.

tials, but has wrought of the prose material a metrical unit so complete and of such distinctive character as to justify, in all but fact, Professor Brown's comment.

Bryn Mawr, Pa.

BEATRICE DAW BROWN.

BRIEF MENTION

The *Historical French Reader, Mediaeval Period*, of Messrs. Paul Studer and E. G. R. Waters (New York, Oxford University Press, 1924; xii + 470 pp.) is a carefully executed text-book. It contains selections from sixty-five texts, of which nine are in Vulgar Latin, the others being in Old French, and ranging from the Oaths of Strasburg to Commynes. It is characterized by thoroughly prepared texts, revised in some instances from the manuscripts, an extensive and useful glossary, and unusually complete bibliographical information. The last feature is likely to be particularly serviceable at present, as the new edition of Voretzsch's *Einleitung* has not yet appeared, and our bibliographies of Old French literature are all decidedly out of date.

Certain defects, however, will militate against the adoption of the books in University classes in this country. One of these is its high price (\$7.00). Another is the fact that the book is intended to serve two purposes, to provide representative selections from Old French literature and "to supply material suitable for instruction in historical grammar." Now, the failure to keep in mind a single definite group of users is a rock on which the editors of more than one otherwise meritorious text-book have struck. In the present instance the twofold object of the book is objectionable in that literary considerations have interfered in the choice and arrangement of linguistic material, and *vice versa*. Some of the Vulgar Latin texts, for example, are not well adapted to illustrate linguistic changes; the Vulgate and Einhard are much less instructive in this respect than a passage from the *Vetus Latina* and more abundant selections from glosses and inscriptions would have been. Again the Old French literary texts arranged as specimens of the various dialects, generally cannot be so definitely dated and placed as the non-literary material given in the third part of Schwan-Behrens. Hence they are less useful for linguistic purposes. From a literary point of view, on the other hand, many scholars object to using short extracts instead of complete texts. In the present book, moreover, there is a division between "standard French" (*i. e.*, *francien*) texts and "Old French Dialects" which is open to serious objection on linguistic grounds. This division, again, separates texts which the student of literature

should study together. One is distressed from either point of view, for instance, to find Marie de France's *Lai des dous amanz*, on p. 88, as a specimen of "standard French" and a passage from Chrétien's *Erec*, on p. 274, as representative of an "Old French dialect." There is an occasional slip in the excellent glossary. Thus, in the sentence from Commynes, "Leur coustume d'Angleterre est que, quant ilz sont au dessus de la bataille, ilz ne tuent riens et par especial du peuple, car chascun quiert leur complaire pour ce qu'ilz sont lors plus fors, et s'ilz ne mettent nulz a finance," *mettre a finance* does not mean to "put to death," but to "put to ransom." Cf. the historical portion of Littré's article *finance* and the *New English Dictionary*, *finance*, sb.¹ 2b, and *finance*, v., 1.

The Cambridge Book of Prose and Verse, in illustration of English literature from the beginnings to the cycles of romance. Edited by George Sampson. (xxxviii + 438 pp. Cambridge, 1924.) In his *Preface* the editor says, "The present volume offers to general readers a selection of passages to illustrate the first volume of *The Cambridge History of English Literature*. . . . Its sections are named from the titles to the chapters, and its headnotes occasionally quote passages from the text." The book is thus meant primarily as a Companion to the *Cambridge History*, and as such it will undoubtedly be found useful to students who for one reason or another must rest content to read early English literature in anthologies. The editor is especially to be commended for his generous treatment of the Latin literature of the period (the selections from which, like most of those in the vernacular, he gives in Modern English translation). He has not always been as accurate as one might wish, however. Thus, he uses Giles's translation of Nennius, though this is not based on the critical text of the *Historia Britonum*. Again, his rather cautious dating of Badon (p. 207) is not in accord with Lot's authoritative conclusions (in *La Vie de Saint Gildas*). Other instances of inaccuracy are the spellings *Kulhwch* (for *Kulhwch*) on pp. 211 ff., and *Troynt* (for *Troit*) on p. 208, though here he has plenty of company. The editor's statement (p. 434) that *Old English* is an ambiguous term is puzzling. What is the ambiguity? On p. 437 he quotes with obvious approval the following: "the proportion of Romantic words is so great that we may correctly say that the literary English of the period [*circa* 1300] was a mixed language." One fears that this superstition about English as a mixed language will maintain itself to the crack of doom. But such blemishes in matters of detail (limitations of space prevent me from citing further instances) will not keep this anthology from being a book eminently useful to the layman, and to students who are not specialists in medieval literature.

K. M.